1960

SPIRITUAL SACRIFICE

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026

https://archive.org/details/spiritualsacrifi0000john_m9s7

The Moorhouse Lectures, 1915

SPIRITUAL SACRIFICE

BY

JOHN STEPHEN HART

M.A., B.Sc.

CANON OF ST. PAUL'S CATHEDRAL, MELBOURNE; WARDEN OF ST. JOHN'S THEOLOGICAL COLLEGE

LONGMANS, GREEN AND CO.
39 PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON
FOURTH AVENUE & 30TH STREET, NEW YORK
BOMBAY, CALCUTTA, AND MADRAS
1916

PREFACE

My aim in these lectures is not to display a scholarship which I do not possess, and for which I have had no opportunity, but to use the ordinary reading of an ordinary priest for a practical and pastoral purpose. The need of the day is to summon men to the Cross and to the Altar of Christ, and to show them that worship means self-abandonment, and is not only for edification or for obtaining grace. I find them thinking of religion as the handmaid of righteousness. I find even those who profess devotion to the Eucharistic Sacrifice thinking of it as the offering of Christ's sacramental presence with a view to their own perfection and salvation. Selfishness in religion is the worst, as well as the most insidious, of all forms of selfishness.

If I trace most of our shortcomings to a Roman source, it is not from any initial prejudice against the Roman Church. To find myself, even apparently, among the prophets of Protestantism is an unwelcome surprise. But I have come to believe not only that the oblation of the consecrated elements is the accidentally born child of Latin ignorance, but also that all Western doctrines of the Atonement are vitiated by the acceptance of

an equally illegitimate Latin assumption, that the death of Christ is humanity's expiatory gift to God.

The lectures contain no new discovery. My main theses will be found plainly stated in Nairne's *Faith of the Old Testament*, in Forsyth's *The Work of Christ*, in Mason's *Faith of the Gospel*, and other authorities equally accessible, and often equally unpretentious. All that I have attempted is a synthesis of the statements of many well-known writers, and their concentration upon the problem of worship in Christ. And therefore I have not thought it necessary to burden my pages with the names of authorities, whom the scholar will recognise without my aid, and the average reader will not trouble to consult.

J. Stephen Hart.

St. John's College, St. Kilda,
July 1915.

CONTENTS

LECTURE		PAGE
I	The Worshipful God	1
II	Pre-Christian Sacrifice	32
III	The Sacrifice of God	69
IV	Some Theories of Atonement . . .	109
V	Worship in Christ	144
VI	Eucharist and Mass	175
VII	The Art of Worship	206
	Appendix with Suggestions for a Liturgy	236

SPIRITUAL SACRIFICE

LECTURE I

THE WORSHIPFUL GOD

"What is man, that Thou art mindful of him? and the son of man, that Thou visitest him?"—Ps. viii. 4.

I

If Theology is the queen of the sciences, worship is the finest of the fine arts. This does not imply that the practice of it must be left to a few gifted souls. It is true that the construction of a liturgy is as much a work of genius as the composition of a symphony, and even to fashion a good collect is as difficult as to write a good sonnet. But though in worship, as in the other arts, creative genius is rare, ordinary minds, with reasonable instruction and thoughtfulness, can appreciate and use what the genius has created. And this is the more true of the forms of worship because suitability for general use is necessarily one of the first tests of excellence in that field. To describe worship as a fine art does not, we may add, detract from its high spiritual dignity. If it is objected that the arts deal with only earthly themes and minister only to æsthetic

enjoyment, the answer must be that no true artist accepts such a definition. All art, he would say, is spiritual; for it is the endeavour—ever baffled and as often renewed—to express in sensible forms the spiritual truths, the insistent ideals of the artist's personality. It is with this lofty conception of its meaning that we claim for worship a place in the category of art, and that the highest place, because it is occupied with truths even more mysterious, with visions even more unearthly, and with hopes still more insistent than other arts, and because it demands an even greater concentration of the entire personality upon them.

Two factors, it appears, then, go to make up worship. It must be first an attitude of spirit, and secondly the expression of that spirit in sensible forms. What these latter should be, or at least what principles should be observed in the expression of worship by them, will be the subject of the last lecture of this course. But we cannot make any progress at all without some common understanding as to the spirit of worship. It is to be found within our spirits. It is their proper attitude when consciously in the presence of God.

To describe the attitude of worship must obviously be difficult because it is a unique experience, not admitting of any true classification, and capable only of illustration from our other experiences. The Theophanies of the Bible, however, suggest one fact of prime importance. In these visions God

is always central and everything else is seen in relation to Him. This is true, for instance, of Isaiah's Seraphim, of the wheels and the living creatures in Ezekiel, and of all the hosts of heaven in St. John's Apocalypse. Similarly in worship we must be conscious of self in relation to God, not of God in relation to self. We must not, so to speak, find God in our environment, or even as our whole environment, but must ourselves enter into His. Herein the worshipper differs from the theologian. To the latter God is an object of thought. To the former, if God is an object at all, He is one towards Whom the whole worshipping personality goes forth, impelled by an "appetite" of love, glad to lose self in the joy of a total self-surrender. We become in the fullest sense lovers of God, and it is in the experience of love that we find the illustration of the nature of worship for which we seek.

We are tempted, it may be, to fall back upon familiar imagery and to suppose that the human love which will best describe the spirit of worship is that of the child for the father. But this would be a mistake. The filial relation does serve to picture what we should be to the Heavenly Father in our daily walk with Him, but it does not do justice to the passion and the ecstasy with which we should be filled when we come into His presence with thanksgiving and praise. For this we must have recourse to the warmer love of the sexes, idealising to the utmost that devotion of a true man for a

worthy woman which enables him to say, "with my body I thee worship." This is the love which the outsider describes as idolatry, because it really does, by a pardonable exaggeration, ascribe to its object something of Divine perfection. This is the love which delights to enthrone its object as the centre of one's life, with more or less sincerity and success dethroning self. It is at least the nearest approach to the abdication of our own centrality that most of us attain to. And in that loss of self we find a new transport of joy and a new sense of being ennobled. The lover believes quite seriously and naturally that—

> "I am named and known by that moment's feat:
> There took my station and degree;
> So grew my own small life complete,
> As Nature obtained her best of me—
> One born to love you, sweet!"

This seems to be exactly what we mean by the spirit of worship. And from it we may pass directly to a real definition in the words of Joseph Addison's hymn—

> "When all Thy mercies, O my God,
> My rising soul surveys,
> Transported with the view I'm lost
> In wonder, love and praise."

Here we are given the transport or passionate emotion of the worshipper; and the sense of a life thereby raised in dignity and worth, is suggested by the phrase "my rising soul." The essential loss of

self is given its place of first importance, while the actual contents of the emotion are rightly described as wonder, love and praise. The praise is for the infinite excellence of God; the wonder is for the continually renewed surprise of it; and the love is the personal impulse towards Him in Whom alone we can be wholly satisfied. The fact that the hymn leaves us cold is itself important. It does not evoke in us the emotions of worship because it is not an act of worship. The writer is far from losing himself when engaged in so careful and so masterly an analysis of his own self-consciousness. He is recalling emotions which at some other time had made him a real worshipper, in order to give us a theological or scientific definition of worship. We rise to a higher religious level in another hymn, in which Charles Wesley adopts—and it is no slight testimony, coming from so great an exponent of religious emotion—the main idea of Addison's verse. The last lines of his "Love Divine, all loves excelling," are—

> "Till we cast our crowns before Thee,
> Lost in wonder, love and praise."

The whole hymn is the expression of a thirst for God which is the soul's prayer for the perfecting of the experience of worship. And in one respect it reveals a defect in Addison's description. Addison was perhaps too little of a mystic to enter into the full meaning of the love divine. He was content

to behold from afar the perfections of God, but love must always ask for more than that. The "moment's feat" of which Browning speaks in the poem already quoted, was the accomplishment of a spiritual union between him and his beloved. "We were mixed at last," he has cried, and in the mixing he has found the meaning of love. "One near one is too far." So in Wesley's hymn the prayer is rightly, "Fix in us Thy humble dwelling," and again—

> "Visit us with Thy salvation,
> Enter every trembling heart."

We shall find that the climax of worship is communion, and that we can only understand either God's love for His creatures or man's love for God, when we see in it the overmastering desire for union with the beloved.

We may observe also, in passing, that Wesley correctly relates morality and religion in an order that will presently be seen to be of great importance. "Pure and spotless may we be," he says, and "changed from glory unto glory," in order that all our perfections may be laid before the Throne of Christ. Morality is not, as some have thought, the end of religion, but rather the beginning of it. The final reward of the glory of righteousness is the power to cast our crowns before God. A perfected humanity will be our opportunity to offer a perfected worship.

There is yet more to be learned from our hymns. Addison tells us how we may achieve the great experience of the lovers of God. We rise to it by means of a survey of all God's mercies. Probably he means such mercies as we mention in the general thanksgiving of our Prayer Book. These may be realised, to begin with, as blessings promised or already granted to ourselves. But we must, of course, free ourselves from mere personal self-congratulation before we can truly worship. A stage in the ascent is perhaps signified by the phrase "all Thy mercies," if we allow ourselves to emphasise the "all." We pass, that is to say, from our private experience to an inclusive view of God's love universally manifested. In Wesley's language we merge the thoughts of our salvation in the prayer, "let us see Thy great salvation." And as all creation and all history give up their witness, thanksgiving for blessings received rises into the vision of the glory of God revealed in them. We lose ourselves in wonder, love and praise.

That we attain to worship by this universal survey of God's mercies—this recognition that His mercies are over all His works—is but a restatement of our first requirement of centrality for Him. And even here the language of love yields us an illustration. It is the lover's fancy and firm conviction that all other beauty is but the frame for the supreme picture of his beloved, and all other people, with all their varied excellences, the court about

his queen. Browning again may voice what we mean.

> " Wanting is—what?
> Summer redundant,
> Blueness abundant,
> —Where is the blot?
> Beamy the world, yet a blank all the same,
> —Framework that waits for a picture to frame:
> What of the leafage, what of the flower?
> Roses embowering, with nought they embower!
> Come then—complete incompletion, O comer,
> Pant through the blueness, perfect the summer!
> Breathe but one breath
> Rose beauty above,
> And all that was death
> Grows life, grows love,
> Grows love! "

This also is worship—ritualistic worship. The infinite superiority of Him Whom we worship, the infinite distance which separates Him from all His creation, does not demand that He should be isolated from them in order to be seen in His Beauty. No theophany gives us the vision of God alone, but shows with Him the hosts of those that worship Him. Earthly beauties, also, and earthly powers, forces of nature and achievements of man, can never be His rivals, but serve to express the glory and beauty of Him Who gave them whatsoever they possess. We may fill the scene with them, and still we see the Lord high and lifted up, and His train fills the temple.

II

So much then in illustration of what we mean by the spirit of worship. To give expression to it will tax the finest of the fine arts. But what is the actual condition of our own people and Church in relation to it? We may say with confidence that of public and corporate worship they have, for the most part, no experience at all. Even the churchgoers do not generally expect to lose themselves in wonder, love and praise. Further, it is difficult to believe that our services are designed to lead to such an end. And, finally, though critics of the Church and her services abound, they evince no consciousness that this is a defect, and make no demand for greater facilities for worship, for assistance towards attaining the loss of self in the transport of the divine vision. On the contrary, whether the criticism comes from a learned professor or from the anonymous correspondent of a newspaper, the cry is for an amended theology. One will bid us return to the old paths, and another will summon us to construct a system that is wholly new and acceptable to modern thought, and it is difficult to say which proposal has the greater number of adherents or the stronger arguments in its favour. But is not the whole discussion beside the point? Theology is necessary, and it must be true theology, and in every generation the wise steward brings out of his treasures things new and old. But the problem is

not a theological but a religious one. The best theology is in vain if its usefulness has disappeared, because men no longer desire God. "My soul is athirst for God—yea, even for the living God. When shall I come to appear before the presence of God?" That was the human need that made it worth while to study theology. The crisis of to-day is the apparent decay of the religious instinct, the thirst for the presence of God. For the lament of every parish priest is not the unbelief or the unorthodoxy of his people. Their glaring defect, he says, is indifference. They are willing to call themselves Christians of one sort or another. They will give spasmodic assistance to Church work. A sickness, a bereavement, the challenge of a great public calamity, will stir them momentarily from their apathy. But too often they sink back into it, and only constant ministrations hold a congregation together. It is plain that Christianity, as we offer it to the people, does not move the people, being such as they are to-day, to any enthusiasm or instinctive response. Somehow or other, a man does not feel the need of knowing himself right with God, or the joy of a reasonable hope in God, or the longing for communion with Him.

It is true that when driven into a corner and forced to defend his indifference, he will base it upon a loss of faith in the old doctrines, or at least upon an uncertainty about them. He thinks the world has learned much during the past few generations which

justifies an attitude of suspense. Now the new learning is, after all, only scientific learning, and so it must be science that is claimed to have undermined religion. The impossibility of this position has been demonstrated over and over again. The field which science explores does not touch the domain of religious truth. It is the world of which our senses tell us, and the internal relations which exist between its parts. Science does indeed dispel the illusions of sense, and it gives a description of the world more accurate and far more detailed than one founded merely on sensation. By means of skilfully framed hypotheses it penetrates in imagination into regions beyond the scope of its most delicate instruments. But even in its hypotheses it never attempts to get away from the sense plane. Thus it never reaches, and so long as it is scientific never can reach, the seat of religion. It cannot find God with its instruments, because He is undiscoverable by bodily sense. It does not need the hypothesis of a Creator, because it accepts the existence of the universe as given. It can never ascribe events to Him as cause, because, for it, cause means only the succession of phenomena. It cannot trace relations between God and the world, because it does not touch the philosophic problem of reality. It has nothing to say upon the problem of the will, because determinism is its necessary assumption. Only so far as the world is a mechanical system, governed by rigorous uniformity, does it come within

the purview of science. If it denies, in an unguarded moment, the existence of freedom and contingency, that is only because it has, without the slightest warrant, assumed that its own field is the whole field of knowledge.

The man who is learned in science has then exactly the same need as every other man to seek elsewhere the grounds for a religious faith. It must not surprise us that, too often, he fails to make the investigation. For the field of science is so large, its recesses still so unexplored, its secrets so full of interest, its promises so alluring, that it offers more than sufficient occupation for a life-time. If business can be so engrossing to a business man that he has no time for anything besides, much more may science be engrossing to a scientist. The heaping up of knowledge is as absorbing as the heaping up of wealth, and it is not checked by the voice of conscience rebuking it for selfishness. But even if this temptation is resisted, the scientist who turns from his work to discuss religious or philosophic problems finds himself in a new and unaccustomed environment. Here his axioms are treated as mysteries, and his assumptions are questioned. The personal equation which has been to him a bugbear is brought to the front as a rich mine of truth. The strong desire to find something to be true is in religion treated as some evidence at least that it is true. From his accustomed point of view this is intellectually immoral. Harmonious as true science

and true religion must ever be, it is plain that a devoted pursuit of science may exercise an influence inimical to religious faith. The mind of the student receives a mould, and acquires a bias, that are unsuited for the sympathetic study of religious philosophy.

The man who appeals to science as justifier of his indifference or even opposition to religion, may then find scientists, and great scientists, to support him, although he has not a single scientific fact to allege, and in the nature of things cannot have. But how comes it to pass that an authority which is weak in proportion as it fails of unanimity, is sufficient to move him from his religious allegiance? We must allow something for the unstinted admiration which the world of our day has for science. The wonderful additions it has made to our knowledge, the practical utility of its discoveries, the new civilisation which it has created, the new conceptions of the universe which have become common property, and perhaps most of all, the earnestness, the industry, the unselfishness even to heroism of scientific men, have dazzled the eyes of the world and intoxicated the minds of men with a sense of human triumph. In proportion to their ignorance of its limitations is their faith in science to explain everything, and to perfect intellectual certainty as well as material prosperity. Nevertheless men would not, we think, have accepted so generally the materialistic realism which is the philosophy corre-

sponding to such an idolatry of science, had they not been already biased in its favour. In fact they wanted to be able to dispense with religion.

We find a reason for their desire in the oppressiveness of the revolution which the nineteenth century effected in the whole circumstances of life. The growth of great cities, the immense development of an industrial class (in which we include the employer as well as the labourer), the rise of democratic institutions with their effect upon individual character, the spread of education, and especially of scientific knowledge—all these have made us inhabitants of a new and enormously complex world teeming with novel problems. Since man, on one side of his nature, is subject to the ordinary laws of evolution, so complete a change of environment inevitably demands a corresponding adjustment of his nature to it, and this cannot be effected instantaneously or without painful stress. We have been, and still are, passing through a period of maladjustment to our environment which exhibits itself in restlessness, and a real peril of destruction unless we can restore the necessary correspondence.

Man, for instance, is not yet properly adapted for city life. Economic laws drive him to it and constantly increase the burden of it, but the vital statistics of great cities betray his unfitness for it. Instinctively the craving for the country asserts itself whenever a holiday can be taken. The love of nature is a new phenomenon in our race, as

modern as the popularity of landscape painting and nature poetry, which are kindred manifestations of the same instinct. The strain upon our physical organisation is proved by the increase of lunacy, as well as less serious but more prevalent nervous disorders. It has changed our habits with respect to food. Few of us can engage in hard work of any kind while fasting, though our ancestors generally went without breakfast. The havoc wrought in us by alcohol, if we give credence to medical testimony and to the practical experience of military leaders and athletic trainers, is in striking contrast to the evident ability of our grandfathers to withstand the effect of considerable drunkenness. The widespread lowering of the birth-rate in civilised communities, whether the result of natural causes or of perverted instincts, is, so far as it is noxious, a further instance of maladjustment.

The burdensomeness of modern life is also betrayed in another series of facts which witness to a desire to escape from its responsibilities, and to gain for ourselves relaxation by becoming onlookers. We love excitement, but it must be vicarious. We read exciting fiction—another quite modern and dominant phenomenon—or we see it acted in a theatre, or we watch a football match or a horse-race. Our grandfathers acted their own excitement, but our recreation is to get out of the strain ourselves and watch others in the midst of it. Similarly we have largely abandoned the old vice of gambling for high

stakes, the joy of which was in the seriousness of loss and gain. Our incessant small bets amuse us because the appeal to chance confers on us a species of irresponsibility.

There is, to sum up the position, an insistent demand for the simplification of life, and there is good reason to suppose that exactly this reaction against the complexity of existence, in itself a purely biological instinct, is the cause of the unwillingness to deal with the problems of religion. The attraction of pseudo-scientific materialism is its apparent simplicity. It seems to us that if there is no other world for which to prepare, we escape the burden upon time and thought and emotion which religion imposes. Or if there is, can we not postpone the consideration of it, and devote ourselves to activities of immediate utility which certainly cannot be postponed? Gordon's sick stock-rider is a true son of the nineteenth century when he meets death with the reflection that, "The chances are, I go where most men go." Where this world makes such overpowering demands upon us we cannot, we say, spare the time—and we mean we cannot afford to spend nervous energy—for worrying about another one. Materialism (and frivolity also in another way) is thus an attempt at self-preservation in a world that overtaxes our powers. It answers in the human sphere to those strange resting stages which the biologist discovers in the lower forms of life, by which, in unfavourable circumstances, such as desiccating

drought, all animal functions are temporarily thrown into abeyance. The similar abeyance of our spiritual functions is also, we may hope, temporary. What we have witnessed is not a final death of religion. Once humanity readjusts itself to its world it will be able, with a widened experience and a wealth of new knowledge, to respond again to the self-revelation of God.

On this subject the conclusion of Eucken's volume on *The Meaning and Value of Life*, is interesting.

" The whole cry of our age is for greater plainness and simplicity, not in the sense of a dull taking-things-for-granted, but in the sense of a spiritual spontaneity. It is a demand which comes alike from the nature of our culture and from our human experience. Through much collection and compilation, research and reconstruction, our culture has become altogether too diffuse and complicated. It confuses great and small, alive and dead, chaotically together; it fails to distinguish between temporal and eternal; in the endless diversity of our historical heritage it cannot discover simple guiding-lines along which to direct our effort towards a steadfast goal." (English trans., p. 145.)

He goes on to say that the simplicity cannot be found in the world around us. It must be found in our new spiritual attitude towards the world.

" Thus only can what is simple be at the same time great; only thus can it be the convincing expression of a new depth in the universe and give us spiritual assurance in regard to it. It is with a simple truth of this kind that early Christianity

moved and rejuvenated the world, and only through such a simple truth can we, in turn, win spiritual anchorage and triumph over the irrational and the chaotic."

The simplification required cannot, we say with Eucken, be really won through materialism, but most certainly by religion. The attempted self-preservation of our generation is truly irrational and suicidal. What we cast away as a burden is in fact that yoke of Christ which alone can make the world-burden bearable and even light. The demand for it is still more imperative than Eucken perceives. Not for our happiness only, but for our very existence is it essential. For always we are faced, in our struggle to adapt ourselves to the new environment, with the possibility of extinction which is Nature's dread second alternative.

III

The Church of Christ has in its keeping the only key to the bewildering complexity of life. Not by the preaching merely of a theology, but by renewing in men a thirst for the presence of God, she, and she only, may save our civilisation from destruction. It is not the world's task to discover religion. Religion on the contrary has to discover the meaning of civilisation and to claim the new world for itself. All that is true in modern science, all that is good in modern life, is necessarily a revelation of God. The

Church must be God's interpreter. Have we begun to treat the discoveries which have changed the face of the earth as, in Illingworth's phrase, treasure trove upon our own manor? On the contrary, at first they frightened us out of our wits. We have recovered sufficiently to claim with a show of calmness that the faith has proved impregnable and the danger has passed. Calmness? Enthusiasm is the only possible attitude towards this new God's truth. If we could portray the overpowering world and all its fullness unified as God's world, the burden of life would be lifted from our shoulders and become again a thing that a man can deal with and still live. It must be turned into thanksgivings. It must be made altar stairs bringing us into God's presence in wonder, love and praise. And the Church which has this work to do for God and man has forgotten how to worship.

If we are to judge men by their common sayings the object of their church-going is self-improvement. They claim the right "to go where they get most good," or they absent themselves with the plea that "they are as good as those who go." They tolerate denominations because "a man can be saved in any Church," and "all are trying for the same place." Ceremonialism is rejected because "it cannot save souls," as if no other use for it were conceivable. No sane man wishes to depreciate the importance of getting religion with a view to salva-

tion. But if this is the whole of religion, God exists for man's sake, rather than man for God. We make God the supreme means of grace, the great Servant of humanity. We make religion the instrument of righteousness, instead of seeing in righteousness the necessary condition for true religion. We make the perfecting of humanity the great event towards which the whole creation moves.

Even among the scholars who have made serious contributions to the study of religion, this view of its purpose is often treated as axiomatic. Sir James Frazer defined religion as "a propitiation or conciliation of powers superior to man which are believed to direct and control the course of nature and of human life" (*The Golden Bough*, 2nd ed., vol. i. p. 63). He is concerned primarily with its primitive forms in which it may or may not be true that it is an endeavour to get the gods on our side for our own advantage. But we cannot acquiesce in a definition which excludes the less selfish forms, the highest and most typical of all. And it is with Christianity in view that Professor Royce makes religion a matter of morality. A religion, he says, "is impossible without some appearance of moral purpose." It must, however, "add something to the moral code. And what it adds is, first, enthusiasm. Somehow it makes the faithful regard the moral law with devotion, reverence, love." This seems to be Matthew Arnold's "morality tinged with emotion." But Royce adds that it must have

a creed, "a more or less complete theory of things." "These three elements, then, go to constitute any religion. A religion must teach some moral code, must in some way inspire a strong feeling of devotion to that code, and in so doing must show something in the nature of things that answers to the code or that serves to reinforce the feeling" (*The Religious Aspect of Philosophy*, p. 3). The creed is as definitely a means to the morality as the feeling is a devotion to it. Harnack says similarly that "the all-important element in Christ's religion is the consciousness of being safe in God" (*What is Christianity?* p. 66), and again that "to represent the Gospel as an ethical message is no depreciation of its value" (p. 72).

Whether the end of religion be called salvation or righteousness, these quotations represent man as religious for his own sake and to achieve his own highest destiny. And so Bender says (as quoted in *Foundations*, p. 506), "Not the question about God, and not the enquiry into the origin and purpose of the world is religion, but the question about man. All the religious views of the world are anthropocentric."

Against all such teaching there stands our Lord's saying, "He that will save his life shall lose it, and he that will lose his life for My sake shall save it." It was an instance of Arnold's critical perspicacity that he singled out that verse as containing the kernel of the Gospel. But his interpretation

of it was perverse. "To find his own soul, his true and permanent self, became set up in man's view as his chief concern, as the secret of happiness; and so it really is." According to the text it really is not; but Arnold would apparently urge a man to fall in love, as the best means to self-culture. From such a position there is but a short step to the representation of God as the servant of morality, and Arnold did not shrink from it. God was to be sufficiently defined as "the Eternal not ourselves that makes for righteousness." The beautiful if unsubstantial visions of Eucken and Royce at least do not descend to that bathos. Royce's paraphrase of the text already quoted is, "Devote yourselves to losing your lives in the Divine life"—which is noble, though Christ said "for Me" and not "in Me." His "loyalty to the beloved Community," and Eucken's view of life in, and by means of, the Universal Spirit at least lift us out of narrow individualism. On the surface they point to a theocentric life, and yet they do after all remain anthropocentric. Their problem is always "the question about man." They have not grasped the gospel that not only the individual but the race must lose itself. For us the main interest of their defect is that it arises from an unquestioning acceptance of the assumption that religion is a human possession—whether divinely given or self-devised—to be used solely for man's own good, his perfecting and his salvation. So they illustrate

the hold which the assumption has on modern thought.

The logical end of the drift is a religion of humanity. Leuba's *Psychological Study of Religion* ends, for instance, as its title would lead us to expect. Grounding religion on psychological facts, he never escapes from them. God indeed must be granted, as an impersonal and non-purposive creative force, but its crowning manifestation is man, and man is his own object of worship.

> " A religion in agreement with the accepted body of scientific knowledge and centred about humanity conceived as the manifestation of a Force tending to the creation of an ideal society, would occupy in the social life the place that religion should normally hold—even the place which the Christian religion lost when its cardinal beliefs ceased to be in harmony with secular beliefs " (p. 336).

Faith in humanity, that is, would be useful for self-culture as faith in God, though confessedly it would be the worship of the creature rather than of the Creator. But it is to this that anthropocentric religion leads. The first step has been taken by the man for whom religion is a method of attaining righteousness, or by him who discards religious practices because he can be good without them. For both of them the perfecting of human nature is already the *summum bonum*, and sooner or later they must worship humanity or nothing.

We challenge that attitude, from beginning to end,

on the ground of religious truth. But Leuba's requirement that the religion of the future shall be "in agreement with the accepted body of scientific knowledge" is sufficient to destroy, on scientific grounds, any prospect of acceptance that it might have had. For anthropocentric religion can only succeed in an anthropocentric universe, and science has made it impossible for us to believe that the real universe is centred in humanity. Exactly that impossibility originates a popular objection to Christianity, which is said to imply that in the immense universe of God this inconspicuous planet has a unique importance for the Creator of the whole. We cannot dispose of this by calling it the fallacy of bigness. Doubtless spiritual intensity does outweigh material immensity. But we have no right to assume that only in our world, and indeed only in man, is there a spiritual nature, and that all the rest of creation is unorganised and material. It is true that the biological law of divergence in evolution forbids us to suppose that human beings exist even on the other planets of our own system. If life exists elsewhere it must, under the very unlike conditions there prevailing, have developed a quite different history leading to a different result. This means more than that the highest beings elsewhere will be of a different species. It is most improbable that anything in the least degree resembling personality exists outside our world. Indeed, living protoplasm seems to have originated here since the

isolation of our world from others; it is not at all likely that an identical substance has appeared independently elsewhere. But it does not follow that other substances, with properties as remarkable as life, or more so, may not exist. We may go further and say that we have no reason to suppose that our universe of matter and energy exhausts the creative powers of God. He may have immaterial universes in which He expresses His will in some form which is not energy. We are not assuming the truth of any of these surmises. We are only denying the legitimacy of the opposite assumption. Any view of God which makes Him essentially the Servant of man is unscientific. We have no right to assert dogmatically our own unique importance for Him, or to assume that the universe has been created solely that at one point in it human personality might be evolved. A religion of humanity is not in accordance with the foundation facts of science. A religion which looks to an ideal humanity as its sufficient goal, or that defines God as the Power that makes for human righteousness, is hopelessly out of date. The God in Whom the present age can believe is One Who fills Heaven and earth with His glory.

It is true that God's revelation of Himself in other worlds is not only unknown to us, but largely unknowable. We know Him as He reveals Himself to us here, and all that the larger possibilities mean to us is that we must not claim Him as exclusively

our own. But even for this world we must allow His interest in all that He has created. Human personality is the highest of the creatures. The process of life, branching out into all sorts of blind ends, which as compared with ourselves may even be called failures, has in us become personal and free, moral and spiritual, and we are for this world "the roof and crown of things." That we are dearer to God than all our world besides, is a justifiable belief, but not that all else exists solely on our account, and without any intrinsic value of its own in the sight of God.

But, it may be said, can we then believe in the Christian religion, which claims that for us men and for our salvation God came down from Heaven and was made man? We can. For in the first place the Incarnation implies God's infinite love for us, but in no sense requires that it should be an exclusive love. If there really are in other worlds spiritual beings capable of making their proper response to the love of God, we may be sure that He can make the proper revelation of Himself to them. But this does not mean as many Incarnations. Incarnation, the exhibition of Himself in human personality, the taking of the creation into personal union with Himself, is the particular mode of revelation adapted to personal beings; and, as we have seen, there is no reason to suppose that elsewhere in the universe such beings are to be found. The infinite perfections of God may require other manifestations, but it is

our part to manifest His Personality—that truth of His Nature to which our human personality corresponds. The Incarnation is to us a supreme and complete revelation, but others may have been made elsewhere, as complete and as appropriate to other natures, although to us unthinkable. We believe in the Incarnation without jealousy. For an anthropocentric religion we should have to claim much more than this—more than we have any right to claim—but for a theocentric religion this amply suffices. It is no longer possible to assert with confidence that God exists mainly for man's sake, and pours out upon him the whole of His love and all His power of self-sacrifice. But that man exists for God remains true, whether we be the only creature of value or one among many. Whatever others may do, man expresses to God His own Personality; and whatever else God may have done, the Incarnation expresses our share, however large or however small, in the love with which God loves all that He has made.

The love of God for us is the reason for the necessity of worship. The end of our creation will not have been realised when man reaches, if he ever can, an ideal righteousness. We do not satisfy the love of God by being all that He would have us be, simply because love is more than admiration, and therefore a loving God cannot rest upon the mere contemplation of human perfection in us. Nor is our end reached by attaining complete and imperish-

able happiness, simply because love is more than benevolence, and a loving God cannot be satisfied with doing us good. Love demands union. Its one recompense is to be loved in return, and to enjoy a fellowship of love. It is so in human love. Why else does the Christian mother weep over the dead body of the child whom she believes to be with Christ, which is far better? Benevolence could ask no more for one before whom there stretches only the promise of more abundant life.

> " Nor blame I Death, because he bare
> The use of virtue out of earth;
> I know transplanted human worth
> Will bloom to profit, otherwhere.
> For this alone on Death I wreak
> The wrath that garners in my heart;
> He put our lives so far apart
> We cannot hear each other speak."

That is the wound to love. The union and fellowship of life have been interrupted. So the love of God implies, besides provision of present or eternal happiness for us, the desire for living personal intercourse and union with us. And on our side this is worship. Worship alone can express, besides obedience, the gladness of obedience—besides service, the willingness of service—the joy on our side also in communion. It is really our love's return for God's love, a response which God must demand. The praise He seeks is not the voice of adulation, the worship does not minister to Divine vain-

gloriousness. But love would not be love if it did not seek the recompense of answering love.

We may even say that for worship we have been created. If we ask why God is a Creator at all, the only possible answer is that creation satisfies the nature of God. For apart from creation He is Himself the only source in which to find the motive. There was in Him no void to be filled, no imperfection to be completed, but He needed to be a Servant, to have a world upon which to pour out Himself. The reason that it is more blessed to give than to receive is that it is more god-like. But this is love. And being love, it asked more than that the world should be the reflection of His glory, and grow under His guidance from strength to strength. It asked that from the world should come back to it an answering voice of gratitude and trust, of praise and love. This we may say accounts for man as the last outcome of the creation of Divine love.

And yet it cannot be the last. "One near one is too far." Union with God is the inevitable goal of creation. And it is in Christ that the union has become a reality. Thus we are wrong to say that the Incarnation is "for us men and for our salvation," if we mean that is the whole reason for it. We must rather regard man as being for the sake of the Incarnation. God's purpose in creating man was that he should be a creature *capax deitatis*, able to be the point of union between God and His creation. In Jesus Christ first, and then in those

who are His, begins the great regeneration and new creation by which all things are to be summed up in Him, whether things in Heaven, or things in earth, or things under the earth.

And it seems to follow that in our worship we should remember that we are the representatives of the universe. To us alone are given reason to frame hymns to God and spiritual power to send them on their heavenward flight. But we do well to sing them as the hymns of the whole creation to which we belong. "O all ye works of the Lord, bless ye the Lord; praise Him and magnify Him for ever." For we are the voice and mouthpiece of the Universe, and we sing as one with all and in the name of all. Worship, therefore, may decline but cannot finally decay. Of Protestantism Harnack says—

"As it neither knows nor tolerates any specific form of worship, any material sacrifice and service to God, any mass and any works done for God and with a view to salvation, the whole traditional system of public worship, with its pomps, its holy and semi-holy articles, its gestures and processions, came to the ground. How much could be retained in the way of form for *æsthetic* or *educational* reasons was, in comparison with this, a question of entirely secondary importance" (*What is Christianity?* English trans., p. 283).

It was indeed! Forms for our own delight or benefit were not worship at all. But so far as this is a true account of it, Protestantism condemned itself to imperfection and transitoriness. Christi-

anity, as a religion of love, must worship. Even the accessories must be brought back—the old ones revived, or new ones devised—in order that when we come to worship we may bring with us the whole world of material things, which also God made and loves.

LECTURE II

PRE-CHRISTIAN SACRIFICE

"Wherewith shall I come before the Lord, and bow myself before the high God?"—Micah vi. 6.

I

When the Apostles essayed to find language in which to describe the value of the Death and Resurrection of Christ, the great acts upon which Christianity is founded, they naturally turned to that older religion in which they themselves had been nurtured. They described the work of redemption as a sacrifice and a propitiation. Similar language was found useful to unfold the meaning of the Christian life, as a living sacrifice, and of Christian worship, as a sacrifice of praise. To the Apostles and their Jewish converts it was intelligible from their own experience, but they were also diligent students of the Old Testament, which they venerated as the Word of God. Later generations, with little or no knowledge of contemporary Jewish practice, had yet this second source of information. The Fathers actually used it in the description both of the Sacrifice of Christ and of their own worship, more freely than the Apostles themselves. It is

important to remember that to a great extent the dependence of Christianity upon Judaism is thus literary rather than organic. We are ourselves very much in the position of the Fathers, inasmuch as we continue to regard the Old Testament as part of the Divine revelation, though we are more alive to its imperfections and progressiveness. For studying the principles of worship the New Testament gives us comparatively little help, while a complete system is contained in the Mosaic law. Though we are rightly led to trust chiefly to our own spiritual instincts, and only so can offer a worship expressive of our own attitude to Divine truth, it would be foolish to neglect altogether the results reached under Judaism. They are confessedly imperfect. They must be brought under the transfiguring spirit of Christianity. But it will be surprising if we find them to be completely alien from our higher point of view. For these reasons a study of Old Testament worship is of far greater importance than that of ethnic religions, and we shall not find it necessary to go much beyond it. At the same time the ethnic systems also bear witness to prevalent cravings of the human spirit, and to the better or worse attempts to satisfy them. Nor is the gulf between them and Judaism so great as used to be imagined. Indeed it is only when seen in the background of the world's manifold religions, that we can properly understand the religion of the Old Testament,

which is for us a very different literature from anything that our forefathers imagined it to be. We are bound to accept the results of Biblical criticism upon which scholars are substantially agreed, even if we think that the last word has not yet been said. They represent the present stage of human knowledge, the only one with which we are immediately concerned. We must therefore assume that the old sacrificial rites did not originate in a single elaborate revelation to Moses, but grew out of an earlier "unrevealed" religion. We cannot treat them as primarily devised to be typical of the work of Christ and with a view to their fulfilment in Him. In so far as they expressed real truths respecting God and man they will indeed be capable of typical and allegorical use by us. But we cannot suppose that such significance was, or ought to have been, in the minds of those who worshipped by their means.

Accepting, as we provisionally must, the post-exilic date of the completed Mosaic law and of the priests' code in particular, we see that it is contemporaneous evidence, not for the period of the Exodus, but for that of the second Temple. Even so its form prevents us from regarding it as a record of what was actually done. It is a programme which may or may not have been found practically possible. Before the Exile we have, in the works of the prophets and in Deuteronomy, another contemporary picture of religion which is strikingly

unlike the legalistic one of the later period. And we can also construct an account of pre-prophetic religion from the allusions in the earlier prophets and from the J and E strata of the Pentateuch. Earlier than this we have nothing but almost wholly unreliable traditions, and are obliged to use methods of comparison and inference if we would claim any knowledge of the genesis of Hebrew religion.

The traditional view of the Old Testament books had, however, been accepted before the Christian era. The worship in which the Apostles joined was already believed to have been revealed to Moses. In estimating the influence of it upon Christianity, and in examining the literary dependence of the Fathers, this has to be remembered. In fact, it is chiefly with the complex system of the post-exilic, so-called Mosaic, law, that we are concerned. But for the understanding of that we must recognise the prophetic contribution to it, and to understand the prophets we must know something of the popular religion against which they fulminated.

When the first prophets appeared, we find that the people sacrificed on the high places. They offered to their God burnt offerings and peace offerings in any of their dwelling-places, but especially at the many sanctuaries of the land. The burnt offerings were a gift to God, acceptable because of the sweet savour of the ascending smoke, accept-

able for their own sake and not for the sake of the worshippers' righteousness or piety. The peace offering, or communion sacrifice, directly effected union with God and man by its own intrinsic virtue, and not at all as a symbol of spiritual desire for God and of God's favour and goodness to man. Sacrifices were made whenever there was a reason for them in the private circumstances of the worshipper, or because of such public events as the gathering of a harvest or the outbreak of a war. They were true worship, though of a low type and involving a low idea of God, because there was in them a true offering to Him, such as He was (erroneously) believed to delight in. And there must have been accompanying them a joyous sense of a good deed done and Divine favour ensured. A sacrifice was thus an occasion of festivity and good fellowship, which unfortunately had a terribly dark side to it. The desire to add value and power to a gift-sacrifice might lead to disgusting hecatombs and sometimes to human sacrifice. If the village and family gatherings were less cruel, they were defiled by shameful drunkenness and impurity. Religious prostitution was common, and Hosea says that Israel learned at the high places the prevalent adultery which threatened to bring the whole nation to ruin.

These rites were even at the time regarded as offered to other gods than Jahveh, and this is the view consistently affirmed in the later books. For

instance, Psalm cvi. speaks of human sacrifices to the idols of Canaan, and the common description of Israel's sin as a spiritual adultery has the same meaning. But even Hosea speaks of the Israel of his day going after many lovers and abandoning her own Husband. "For she did not know that I gave her the corn, and the wine, and the oil, and multiplied unto her silver and gold, which they used for Baal." There is no sign, however, that the popular worship of Jahveh was in any way purer or more spiritual than that of other gods. In fact, there is strong evidence that He was regarded as on perfect equality with the gods of the surrounding nations. Jephthah's message to the King of Ammon was: "Wilt thou not possess that which Chemosh thy god giveth thee to possess? So whomsoever Jahveh our God hath dispossessed from before us, them will we possess." The parallelism between the two gods is complete. Jahveh could be worshipped only in His own land. David's complaint was that men have driven him from the inheritance of Jahveh, saying, "Go serve other gods." Elisha did not rebuke Naaman's request for Israelitish earth on which to worship Israel's God. Jahveh is simply the tribal deity, a kind of genius of the nation, or else the Baal, or lord, of the land and giver of fruitfulness. His nature and character were, therefore, much like those of the other gods, and so was His worship. Whether human sacrifice was offered to Him has

been doubted, but Micah thinks it quite a conceivable means of approaching Him. Hebrew minds were not shocked when told that He commanded the offering of Isaac, and though the point of the story is the discouragement of human sacrifice, that only suggests that there was need to discourage it. Religious prostitutes were certainly to be found at the Jerusalem Temple, as well as at Shiloh, in Eli's day.

Along with a limited conception of their God's power and sphere went a readiness to ascribe to Him earthly dwelling-places. The ark was certainly more than a national heirloom. The story of its adventures among the Philistines, and the story of the fate of Uzzah, are intelligible only on the hypothesis that Divine power resided in it. It did not embody a form of God, but was a sacrament of His presence or a place in which He dwelt. When Jacob at Bethel says, "This stone" (not this sanctuary) "shall be God's house," he comes very near to making it a fetish. The stone pillar was probably in existence at Bethel when the narrative was written, as similar pillars were before the Temple, and as Isaiah foretold would be in the border of Egypt. Similarly Hosea speaks, with at least tolerance, not only of pillars, but of *teraphim*, actual images used in divination and certainly idolatrous though they were found in David's house. It was only in the prophetic age that all such representations were repudiated

along with the calves at Bethel and the brazen serpent at Jerusalem.

II

The prophets' voices were raised in consistent denunciation of the whole religious life around them, its idea of God, its limitation of His power, its images, its materialistic theory of sacrifice, the sacrifices themselves and all their attendant wickedness. Their own religion was not, however, entirely a novelty, and to themselves they always seemed the champions of an older and purer faith. Traditional exegesis imagines throughout the history the existence of the Mosaic law more or less obeyed at Jerusalem and in earlier days wherever the tabernacle was. The prophets do not support this view. When they denounce the people's idolatry or other unfaithfulness, they do not appeal to the standard set by the Temple worship. On the contrary, the Jerusalem Temple seems to have been much like any other high place. Their appeal to antiquity is a quite different one. Amos (v. 25) shows that there was a tradition of a time when no sacrifices were offered to Israel's God. From the instances collected by Andrew Lang it appears that the tradition is by no means an impossible one. It is a fact that high gods are not always worshipped by those who believe in them. The interpretation of the fact and its origin are matters of controversy which need not detain us, but it

seems certain that the unworshipped gods are generally moral beings, and the assertion of their people is that they are neglected because gifts cannot influence them. Some in Israel may have had a similar opinion about Jahveh. The earliest documents of the Pentateuch, which are pre-prophetic, represent Jahveh as a righteous God whose favour is bestowed only upon those who yield Him a righteous obedience. The Decalogue, the date of which is very early, does the same, and can scarcely be the first beginning of moral religion. We do not need to assert that the righteousness which Jahveh was at that time thought to demand, was as lofty as that inculcated by Judaism or Christianity. It could sanction the treachery of Jael and the wars of extermination. Room was left for a slowly rising standard, but the highest known to any age would always be the will of God. The existence of such religion, even in a few leading spirits of each generation, is what the modern view allows us as a substitute for the traditional one of the perfect Mosaic law, acknowledged as Divine, but almost wholly neglected and disobeyed. It appears, then, that the pre-exilic prophets are to be thought of as inheriting a religion which knew God as essentially a righteous God, demanding righteousness from men, and which set small store by sacrifice if it did not directly condemn it. But we cannot tell how far these features had been explicitly avowed, or by how large a leaven among

the people their truth had been recognised. The spiritually minded were perhaps, like the seven thousand who had not bowed the knee to Baal, an incoherent body unknown to one another and to their own leaders. On the whole the prophets were confronted by a nation whose idea of God was materialistic and narrow, while the idea of religion was a system of sacrifices nor far removed from magical rites, and entirely devoid of moral conditions. In both respects they declared war against prevailing conceptions.

In the prophets direct assertion of Monotheism is hardly provable. But they attribute so much to the sovereign power of Jahveh that they leave no room for rival gods. The heavenly bodies are His creatures, and by Him divided unto all the peoples, a statement which brings all the peoples also under His government. And this Amos asserts of one after another of Israel's neighbours. Isaiah declares that even the Assyrian, little as he acknowledges it, is the servant of Jahveh. Stress is laid continually upon the fact that Jahveh Himself brought Israel out of Egypt and made him stronger than his enemies. But at this point there emerges a difference of view. For Hosea alone God is essentially one who loves Israel, as husband when the covenant is in his mind, as father when he thinks of the tenderness of the Divine providence. "When Israel was a child, then I loved him and called My son out of Egypt. I taught Ephraim to

go. I took them in My arms, yet they knew not that I healed them. I drew them with cords of a man, with bands of love." And again: "I will betroth thee unto Me for ever; yea, I will betroth thee unto Me in righteousness and in judgment, and in loving kindness and in mercies." But Amos writes more sternly: "You only have I known of all the families of the earth; therefore I will visit upon you all your iniquities." A mediating doctrine is discoverable in Deuteronomy, but its prevailing thought is that Jahveh loved the patriarchs and treasures the nation for their sake. Of Israel as it actually is it must be said, "Not for thy righteousness or for the uprightness of thine heart dost thou go in to possess their land; but for the wickedness of these nations the Lord thy God doth drive them out from before thee, and that He might establish the word which He sware unto thy fathers." The God of love is lost sight of in the avenging God of righteousness. Isaiah closes in gloom his parable of the vineyard of the Lord. Even the promises of renewed mercy after the judgment that is imminent are mostly regarded with suspicion by modern commentators, as the additions of later generations to whom the ways of God had been more clearly revealed. Without taking an extreme view about this point, we must still confess that the message of the early prophets was mainly one of severe righteousness, of a righteous God who required righteousness above all things, and was

inflexibly stern in His punishment of iniquity. Save for its impersonality Matthew Arnold's definition suits well the prophetic religion. God is the Eternal One who makes for righteousness. But the prophet saw almighty Sovereignty where Arnold goes no further than a prevailing tendency.

We have already seen that this is not a temper which fosters worship. The spirituality of the prophets revolted against the materialism of existing religion. But even if it had been less defective, they had no power to respond to the self-abandonment of a worship which, however defiled, was full of joyful spontaneity. They were self-centred because God was also centred on human righteousness. Keen observer of nature as Amos was, he found nothing in it but parables of God's dealing with men. The natural phenomena of recent years were to him Divine judgments upon Israel. Drought and mildew, locusts, pestilence and earthquakes, were God's warnings against sin, bidding Israel prepare to meet its God. When we turn from any of the early prophets to Psalms like the 104th and the 145th, or the second Isaiah, we see what is missing in them. They depreciated worship because they imagined God as existing only for righteousness. Hence they could write a verse of such narrow import as, "What doth the Lord require of thee but to do justly and to love mercy and to walk humbly with thy God?" Micah does not say that a man's sacrifices will only be acceptable

if he makes them the expression of those moral characteristics. He gives the latter as an alternative method of approach to God, to be substituted for the sacrificial method. In the same spirit Jeremiah declares the word of Jahveh Sabaoth to be, "I spake not unto your fathers nor commanded them, in the day that I brought them out of the land of Egypt, concerning burnt offerings or sacrifices; but this thing I commanded them, saying, Hearken unto My voice, and I will be your God and ye shall be My people; and walk ye in all the way that I command you, that it may be well with you." Hostility to sacrifices is found also in Isaiah, in Hosea, and in Amos, as well as in certain Psalms of the first and second books (xl., l., li.). It has been claimed that what they objected to was the spirit in which sacrifice was offered, and the defilement of worship by immorality, and this may be true enough if it only means that they would not have objected equally to the sacrifices of the second Temple, or those at which our Lord was present. Even to these they would perhaps have assigned no great importance. But if it means that they only wished to purify the worship of their own day, we must deny it, in spite of a verse here and there in which the retention of sacrifice in the glorious future is contemplated. For where shall we find any attempt to institute such a reform? In Deuteronomy certainly, but not in the impassioned oracles of the prophets. On the contrary,

their established principle, as we have seen in Micah, is that righteousness and penitence and praise are the true worship, without which no sacrifice avails and beside which none is needed. Amos, when he proclaims that God will not accept burnt offerings or regard peace offerings, adds, "But let judgment roll down as waters and righteousness as a mighty stream," and confirms his view by the absence of sacrifice in the wilderness. Hosea says that "God desires mercy and not sacrifice; and the knowledge of God more than burnt offerings." The 40th Psalm gives us the same contrast, rightly summarised by the Epistle to the Hebrews in the words, "He taketh away the first" (the sacrificial system) "that He may establish the second" (a righteous obedience). The same comment would apply to the prophets as a whole. Indeed, to say otherwise is to misunderstand the character of a prophet. He is a man with a vision. He has grasped great truths, and he sees around him great evils. He is aware also of living in a last time, on the verge of a crisis. There is no place in his programme for weighing expediencies, for separating the wheat from the chaff. He has no tenderness for the old ways, no desire to preserve any seed of goodness that may be in evil institutions. His mission is "to pluck up and to break down, and to destroy and to overthrow," that he may be able also "to build and to plant." The prophet of Israel saw around him practices of

religion which from his moral standpoint were bad, which enshrined a low view of God, divorced worship from righteousness, and encouraged immorality. What did it matter to him that later generations might evolve good from them? The day of the Lord was at hand. Israel must prepare to meet its God. It must cast out the evil thing which defiled the land.

The attitude of Deuteronomy is very different. It exhibits the prophetic monotheism, and the prophetic demand for righteousness and obedience to God, along with a marked tenderness towards the poor and the distressed. But it makes no attempt to abolish sacrifices. It does indeed elevate the moral law above them. At the conclusion of the Decalogue it says, "These words the Lord spake with a great voice, and He added no more." Though the law of worship, as well as the laws governing society, were given by Moses as the commandments of Jahveh, they were not to be regarded as a direct revelation. There was no pattern of them seen in the mount. Yet sacrifices were commanded and regulated. Deuteronomy is, in fact, the practical application of the prophets' principles, and its author was a practical statesman. He is not averse from compromise. He aims at sanity rather than thoroughness, and considers what is possible and what is expedient. Hence the language differs from that of the prophets, as the Book of Common Prayer differs from

the unguarded and unbalanced statements of Foxe's martyrs. The abolition of sacrifice is not possible, but it may be restricted within narrow limits. For this is what the law of the central sanctuary really comes to. Jerusalem had long been a sanctuary, but there had been many others to which pilgrimages were made. The reform presented itself to contemporaries as the abolition of these and of all local sacrifices. "If ye say unto me, We trust in the Lord our God: is that not He whose high places and whose altars Hezekiah hath taken away, and hath said to Judah and Jerusalem, Ye shall worship before this altar in Jerusalem?" The central sanctuary represents the prophet's crusade against sacrifice, so far as it was politically wise to adopt it. The reason for the exception in favour of Jerusalem is not clear. The least probable theory is that worship was more pure there than elsewhere, or under more complete control. It may have been the price paid for the support of the influential court circles. Or what a late writer supposed to be Jeroboam's fear may have been Hezekiah's hope, as it was Josiah's policy. The one sanctuary might become a rallying-point not for Judah only, but for the remnant of the ten tribes, and so strengthen the national unity and loyalty to the house of David. Whatever the reason, Jerusalem remained a centre of sacrificial worship, and Deuteronomy remained to influence the religion of the post-exilic period. But the compromise,

significant as it was, and (in view of later history) controlled by Divine providence, does not completely represent the prophetic position.

III

It is necessary to speak plainly about the limitations of prophetism because by so many writers of our time it has been painted in idealistic colours, and Micah's requirement has been treated as the high-water mark of religion. We do not forget that their wedding of morality to religion has been one of the greatest advances that man ever made in religious progress. It has become an abiding possession for all times, and in particular a necessary presupposition of Christianity. It is so great a truth that for us it has become axiomatic, and we needed to be reminded of our debt to the prophets. But morality is by no means the whole of religion. Modern Protestant theologians attribute an exaggerated value to prophetism, because its outlook is also theirs, and therefore they do not perceive its narrowness. They are too anthropocentric. But as a matter of fact the prophets failed. Their religion was not all that mankind needed, and sacrifice and worship returned after the Exile, developed and spiritualised, to work their own work. It is easy to describe legalism as a falling away from true religion. In part it was, and that part was not unconnected with the legacy of the

prophets, but in part it was a schoolmaster to bring men to Christ, a forward step in the history of religion. We must try, then, to get some idea of the meaning of so-called post-exilic legalism, and to see what it contained of value, over and above its inheritance from the prophets. We shall depend largely on Kautzsch's article in the extra volume of Hastings' *Dictionary*.

The inheritance included, in the first place, a fully developed monotheism, a belief in the sole sovereignty of God, to which the new school gave clearer expression in the creation story of Genesis i. and in the nature psalms. It carried with it a conception of His ownership of all space and all time, all men and all their property. But it was found possible to assert His special relation to portions of the universe by means of the very ancient idea of firstfruits. From St. Paul we may learn the significance attached to that idea. "If the firstfruit is holy, so is the lump: and if the root is holy, so are the branches." The community of nature which pervades all, enables the part to be put for the whole. The divine ownership of the whole may be expressed by a definite and complete surrender to Him of the firstfruits. The sacrifice of one sheep confesses God's claim upon the flock, or rather upon the owner of the flock and all his possessions. Sacrifice becomes a symbol of self-sacrifice. The Levitical rules prescribe a ceremony to enforce this meaning; the offerer must in every

case lay his hands upon the head of the victim, and so identify himself with it.

But it is not only of sacrifice that the principle of firstfruits is asserted. The earth is the Lord's and the fullness thereof, but the land of Israel is especially His, and in the holy land an increased degree of holiness belongs to Jerusalem the holy city, and in Jerusalem to the Temple, and in the Temple to the holy place, and in it to the holy of holies. Similarly the people of God was a holy people, but they were set free to engage in secular affairs by delegating the service which they owed to God to the Levites, who represented the whole nation because they—in the place of the firstborn sons, who might accordingly be redeemed—had been set apart to be God's firstfruits. All time belonged to God, but the same principle assured men that He was content with the complete separation from secular work of the Sabbaths and other holy days.

The importance of this general principle of firstfruits, or *terumah*, is, for us, that it means the adoption of symbolism as the method in which religion expresses itself. Christian writers upon the Old Testament have so allowed their imagination to run riot, that they have brought discredit upon the interpretation of it as symbolical of spiritual truth. But such an interpretation has a measure of historical warrant, and in particular it was only as symbolising spiritual worship that the

sacrificial system held its own after the Exile. "The due levied upon the whole gives symbolical expression to the confession that Jahveh is incontrovertibly Lord of everything. With this admission He is graciously satisfied, and by the sacred *terumah* all the rest is also hallowed and its safe use procured for Israel" (Kautzsch, *D.B.*, v., p. 717). Not only was the *terumah* symbolical, but every true symbol is a *terumah*. It is not the arbitrary selection of one thing to stand for another. It is always a firstfruit, a part standing for the whole, a single example out of a class, a single instance of a general law. A symbol is, in fact, appropriate so far as it is really identical with the thing symbolised. In baptism the washing of water symbolises the cleansing from sin exactly so far as the two processes are identical—that is, so far as both are the removal of the undesirable. But baptism expresses nothing about sin except that it is undesirable, and nothing about the action of the Holy Spirit except that it is a cleansing.

Israel returned from Babylon to make the Temple, the sacrifices, and the law the centre of their national life. The prophets had to wait a long time for the canonisation of their writings, but nevertheless they had done their work. They failed to accomplish what they desired, but they forced the nation to reconsider the meaning of sacrifices. No longer could these be actual gifts to God or direct manifestations of Divine power. They must be recon-

ciled with the true monotheistic faith and with the requirement of right moral and spiritual dispositions in the worshippers of the righteous God. They accomplished the reconciliation by becoming symbols of spiritual realities.

It may be said that this brings us to a stage at which the distinction between prophetism and sacrificial worship ceases to be of much importance. The antagonism between the prophet and the primitive rites was natural and fundamental. But when sacrifices became symbolical of spiritual states, when they simply expressed a man's praise and thanksgiving and the honour which he would give to God, or his hearty desire for unbroken fellowship and communion with Him, did not the antagonism largely disappear? For the prophets also insisted on these spiritual offerings, and approved of their expression in vocal worship. Is not the difference, then, merely one of method? One party wants to sing psalms and the other wants to use symbolical actions. Is the latter method so much the better that its use is essential? On the whole, we think, human experience shows that it is, and there are certainly some reasons why it should be. There is no need to extol one to the exclusion of the other, and that mistake has not been made by sacrificial worshippers. They have generally, at any rate in the Christian Church, accompanied their actions by words of praise and prayer. But on the other side the

same defence cannot be made. Ceremonies have been discarded as unedifying, in forgetfulness of the fact that edification is not the primary object of worship. Symbolical ritualism is a language that God understands as well as spoken words, and it is addressed to Him. Certainly the worshipper should not use a tongue to him unknown, but the language of action is at least as easily learned as the language of words. It can be taught to younger children and to more ignorant adults than words can—such words, at least, as are adequate to the needs of the learned. In symbols each finds as much as he brings. They mean much to the adept, but something even to the babe, and this makes them particularly suitable for the worship of a " mixed " congregation. They are one of the strongest bonds between men of varying minds and culture. Hence it is that corporate worship invariably decays unless it is an action worship.

" Religions in history are not theories nor sentiment nor mystical aspirations, but the traditions of a social life guaranteed by the consecration of a ritual. A spirit animates such institutions; but the institutions give consistency to the spirit, and keep it in touch with life. It has been said often that the religion of the prophets was materialised, and narrowed and lowered by the Law. Properly speaking, a religion of the prophets has never existed, any more than a religion of Jesus has existed, but there was a large and strenuous effort to raise the worship of Israel towards an ever-

growing perfection in all that concerns religious belief, the moral sense and social justice. So far as that effort tended to disengage itself from institutions and to recognise no law but personal inspiration, it was lost and could only lose itself in the void. In so far as it was embodied in an institution, it lived and worked. Jeremiah represented the pure spirit of prophetic Jahvehism. It was the written law, that he despised, which saved out of his generous dreams all that was able to be utilised by the future time" (Loisy, *Religion of Israel*, English trans., p. 188).

Another reason for symbolical action is that man is by nature active rather than contemplative. He is always impatient of talking that does not lead to doing things. It is perfectly right that the body should worship as well as the mind, and there is a great gain in ceremonialism if it saves us from intellectualism. In sacrificial worship the action is the surrender of man's possessions. It is costly while words are cheap, and in costliness there is a real advantage. Not only is sincerity tested, but love is satisfied. No true lover ever contented himself with sugared words, but always he seeks for opportunities of labour, daring, or sacrifice. It is so with the lover of God.

There was also, at the foundation of the ancient sacrifices, a belief in a common life of men and animals, and in this also there is a truth worthy of representation before God. For, after all, man is, on one side of his nature, an earthly creature, and there is no worship in truth as well as in

spirit—not in fullness of truth—where this is not recognised. With greater knowledge than primitive ages possessed, we can no longer represent our relation with the lower world as one of comradeship. But if we are the dominant highest result of evolution, all the greater is our responsibility towards it all. We worship on behalf of it, and it is clear gain if we can come into God's presence with representative gifts from the world in which and over which He placed us, and out of which He made us. This especially we do in Holy Communion, where, if it is not fanciful to press the truth so hard, it is, most fitly, a humanised world that we present. For bread, and even the wheat of which we make it, are essentially of human manufacture, and to a less extent so is the wine. As the animals of old told of comradeship, community of life, so these speak of dominance, and creativeness in the world.

Thus it appears that in contrast with the aloofness from creation, the unnatural intellectualism, the niggardly self-repression of the synagogue, which is also the Puritan conception of a religious service, the sacrificial ideal stands out in the glory of clear-eyed, full-blooded life, natural, comprehensive, spontaneous, rejoicing with God in the works of His hands, and loving Him freely for all His mercies' sake.

The post-exilic religion, which had rightly refused to abandon sacrifices, accepted the prophetic limita-

tion of them to the central sanctuary at Jerusalem, and this, though in some ways clear gain, was not an unmixed good. It was a gain inasmuch as it provided a centre towards which worship might be directed. No longer could men think of God as dwelling in sacred stones or trees, still less as identifiable with any visible image or representation. But the mind requires some point upon which to concentrate itself in worship. Complete freedom from the human limitation which expresses itself most grossly in idolatry is perhaps impossible for us. God is incomprehensible. We cannot grasp the full truth of His infinity. The attempt to be in tune with the infinite is the bane of religion. For it leads only to the negativing of all limits in God, and thereby to the emptying of our own conception of Him of all positive content. Exact truth—even admitting that God must be absolute and Infinite—means that "not only graven images are disallowed, but in the end all determinate thoughts of this super-essential, super-rational, super-personal, nay, super-absolute unity that is neither subject nor object, and in which all difference begins and ends" (Ward, *Realm of Ends*, p. 35). "Every so-called conception of God is necessarily that of an idol." But if we are to worship God we must have a conception of Him. The worshipper cannot breathe in the fine air of abstract philosophy. We are not called upon to defend ourselves if in our highest moments of

devotion we do, strictly speaking, set up an idol in our hearts. The most that can be asked of us is that our concept shall be the highest and most worthy of which we are capable. An analysis of our consciousness will show that the most spiritual of us does to a certain extent localise God in worship. We put ourselves in His presence, or, what is the same thing, picture Him as being before us. It is not the ascription to Him of finiteness, as if He were here and not elsewhere (which is the danger of the crucifix and the reserved Sacrament), but a focussing of His omnipotence in one spot. All the infinity of His Personality is, as it were, concentrated upon me, and I am face to face with God.

For corporate worship, however, we must not bring the focus too close to ourselves. If we do that we become an assembly of private worshippers, each one absorbed in his own idol, or representation of God's presence. Christ's word, "There am I in the midst of them," itself a recognition of that necessary localisation of which we are thinking, supposes a circle of worshippers with Him as centre—for certainly no one of them will turn his back upon Christ. When instead of this formation we place ourselves in rows, all facing the same way, we must focus the presence of God in front of the congregation, so that the minds of all may have a common direction. Probably that is exactly what we do whenever we are conscious that our prayer is being simultaneously offered by all the brethren present, and that each

one offers it as the prayer of the whole assembly. Here, therefore, is the philosophy of the sanctuary, the holy spot upon which is concentrated for our worship that Presence which, as we freely confess, Heaven and the Heaven of heavens cannot contain.

The spiritual conception of the sanctuary was won for all time in the provision made by the post-exilic Jews. Nothing could better describe the particular kind of localisation of the Divine presence which we must accept as a practical necessity. The recognition of a universal presence making all space holy, but also of an intensified holiness ever increasing towards the spot which is the centre of worship, is the proper antithesis to all base forms of idolatry, the corrective of all false ascriptions of finiteness to God. It carried with it, then, the practice of praying towards the holy place, and of windows open, like Daniel's, towards Jerusalem, just as it still carries with it the practice of reverence towards the altar. But it always rested on the promise, "My Name shall be there," and not on a materialistic and idolatrous attribution of exclusive localisation of God.

The central sanctuary thus gave a visible centre to the worship of Israel, but the limitation of sacrifices to it also gave to these an added dignity and solemnity by making them the one national worship. The majority of the people, after the first few years when Jerusalem was practically the nation, could not themselves be present. For

personal religion the synagogues were necessarily established throughout the land. But the link with the Temple was not forgotten. Not only the priests had their regular courses and seasons of residence and ministry at Jerusalem. The people also were supposed to go up in turn to represent the worshipping nation. Even when this was only done by delegation, simultaneous services in the synagogue helped to keep the ideal before men's minds. And if these also were neglected the lesson had been learned that the sacrifices were representative. Any Israelite who had the opportunity might be present in person, but, whether he were present or absent, the offering was made for him—for him, that is to say, as a member of the nation. Thus there arose the conception of a congregation that worshipped in the name of the whole people of God, which was destined to bear fruit in the corporate worship of the Christian Church. Our Eucharist is always the Eucharist of the Catholic Church—"hanc oblationem servitutis nostræ, sed et cunctæ familiæ tuæ"—and the Apostolic Church learned its lesson in the Temple at Jerusalem.

On the other hand, the restriction of sacrifice to the Temple left most men dependent for their own habitual worship upon the services of the synagogue. For them sacrifice ceased to be a normal exercise, and became only an occasional event. In the synagogues, instead of sacrificing, they read about

sacrifices. Duty to God became very largely identified with obedience to the written law expounded in the synagogues. At no time were the sacrifices held to be of slight importance. It is recorded that even in the awful famine of the last siege of Jerusalem, victims were obtainable for daily burnt offerings; and at an earlier time, the cessation of sacrifice was regarded as the worst result of the persecution of Antiochus Epiphanes. But all this did not enter into ordinary religious life, and indeed it is sometimes affirmed that all rational meaning disappeared from the ritual of the Temple, and that the offerings were made in blind ultra-conservative obedience to the law, made because of the primitive command of God, without an idea why the command was given.

We must not suppose that the law was to Jews generally "a yoke," as St. Peter said, "which neither our fathers nor we were able to bear." The 119th Psalm, with many other passages to the same effect, shows that it was capable of attracting the utmost devotion and love. The greatest opponent the law ever had, confessed that in itself it was holy, just and good. Implicit obedience, again, is no bad thing. The fence about the law, which led Pharisaism to such extremes of punctiliousness, had not its origin in servile fear, but in careful reverence for a holy treasure. Nevertheless its principle was wrong, because it was essentially non-progressive, and because mere obedience to a

law must inevitably become dead externalism. Implicit obedience to commands, the reason for which is not known nor expected to be known, may indeed begin as personal devotion to the giver of them. But inasmuch as the absence of rational enquiry severs the servant from the mind and purpose of the master, the personal element must sooner or later be lost. Hence it was from Pharisaism and not from Sacerdotalism that Christ met the strongest opposition. Although priests joined with scribes in condemning Him, the scribes did it as scribes, the priests not as priests, but as rulers of the people anxious about their own place and authority. Christ spoke sternly about scribes and Pharisees, but He had no word of condemnation for the Temple and its services. On the contrary, its defilement with secular business moved Him to indignation, and its destruction meant for Him the final rejection of the nation.

If, then, there was decay in religion after the return of the exiles, we must not ascribe it to the restoration of the sacrificial system, renewed and purified as that was. To some extent it may have resulted from the fixing of its rites by a supposedly Divine revelation, which robbed worship of that spontaneous and generally human character that all true worship must possess. We who groan under the burden of a stereotyped Prayer Book should be able to sympathise with later Judaism. But the decay sprang chiefly from

the restriction upon sacrifice which was the direct outcome of the prophetic law of the central sanctuary, and the practical victory of a religion of mere morality and law—warmed, it may be, by emotion—which was what they contended for. The prophetic ideal, "to do justly and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with their God," was exactly the religion of the synagogues, and it made them the homes of religious deadness. When we ask what have been the lasting benefits to the world of Old Testament religion, we must confess the debt which theology owes to the prophets, and which indeed the religious life owes to them, but it is to the sacrificial system that we must turn if we would learn about true worship and the way to hold communion with God. How great our debt is in that respect perhaps we have not even yet realised, but certainly part of it is the ability to describe in some measure the meaning of the Sacrifice of the Son of God.

IV

New Testament references to the old sacrifices almost always speak of an aspect which hitherto we have ignored. Throughout the history, but increasingly towards the end of it, sacrifice was employed for piacular reasons as well as for worship—with a manward as well as a godward destination. We have postponed the discussion of this

because our information comes almost wholly from late sources, but its origin must be sought in very primitive ideas. The sacrifices known to us as sin offerings and trespass offerings were offered for sins committed in ignorance and for certain other specified ones which could only be done consciously. They are a development from the peace offering, from which they differ in two leading features. The first is that the sinner for whom the offering was made, with his fellows of the same order, was excluded from the feast upon the victim. Thus a sin offering for a layman, whether ruler or commoner, might not be eaten by laymen, though the priests, representing a higher degree of holiness, were not debarred. The sin offering for a priest, or for the whole nation in which priests were included, might not be eaten even by priests. The human share could then neither be used by man nor offered to God, and had to be burnt without the camp, simply as a reverent way of disposing of it. All this is so natural that no further explanation seems to be needed. It negatives any supposition that the sin was thought to be transferred to the victim. Only in the case of the scapegoat the sins of the nation were confessed over the animal's head, which then could not be offered to God, but was led away into the wilderness, bearing the sins upon it. Probably the live bird which atoned for the leper also carried away his uncleanness when it was allowed to fly. These

two rites, from their archaic and magical character, must have been survivals from a primitive age, though only recorded in late documents. It is noteworthy that the New Testament does not use them as symbols of Christ. The flesh of the sin offerings, in which we must include the sacrifices of the Day of Atonement, did not, on the other hand, receive the defilement of sins, but was most holy. Otherwise one does not see how it could have been offered to God.

The second and most important feature of the sin offering, the rite of the blood, also carries us back, though the connection may be indirect, to primitive and even magical conceptions. All nations have had the idea that the essence of life, the seat of vitality and personality, is in the blood. Hence to drink the blood is the surest means of absorbing the virtue of the victim. When this became too repulsive to be done literally, communion in the blood was obtained by sprinkling it on the person. The share of the god could be given to him similarly, by pouring it upon the sacred stone or image or altar, which represented him. Thus the blood-rite looks back to the ideas of contagious magic. In the fully developed Levitical system survivals of it remained in the cleansing of the leper and the consecration of priests. In both cases, though in a different sense, the blood-anointing conferred the holiness of the victim. Another sprinkling of blood, with a similar meaning, was that upon the door-

posts in the passover rites. Tradition recorded that at the making of the Sinaitic covenant all the people, as well as the books and tabernacle furniture, were sprinkled with the blood of the sacrifices. In the late ritual of the sin offering, however, a very different ceremony was substituted. Instead of being applied to the sinner it was sprinkled upon the horns of the altar. Now, if there is any analogy between this and the other rites that have been mentioned, it is the altar rather than the sinner that is cleansed. We are expressly told that on the Day of Atonement such is the intention. The high priest "shall make atonement for the (most) holy place because of the uncleanness of the children of Israel, and because of their transgressions, even all their sins; and so shall he do for the tent of meeting that dwelleth with them in the midst of their uncleanness." And again: "He shall go out unto the (great) altar and make atonement for it." Similar language had been freely used by Ezekiel, and unless there is definite reason against it, which there does not seem to be, we must extend the same meaning to the ordinary sin offering. Then we can understand why the priest's sin offering is applied to the altar of incense, instead of to the great altar as in the case of the layman. In each case it is the sinner's proper place of offering that needs to be cleansed. The law, in fact, took cognisance of sin, not so much as a moral defilement of the sinner or a bar to his soul's welfare, but as

an offence against the sanctuary and all the national worship. Many of its regulations were intended to prevent a man who had been rendered unclean from approaching the sacrifices. Now this is just what would have happened if the man had sinned unwittingly, for he would have been unclean without knowing it. Even in the case of those specified sins which can scarcely be done in ignorance and for which, nevertheless, a sin offering might be made, the same is true. They are perjury, cheating, oppression, and appropriation of lost articles. They are just such sins as a man might, for a time, deny even to himself, trying to convince himself that he had justification for his action. Hence he would have presented himself at the altar as a clean person. Properly speaking, therefore, the object of the sin offering was not to obtain God's pardon for the sinner, but to reopen the means of grace, the way to God for him.

The sin offering had been, previously to these special ceremonies, already offered to God, and the blood of it, therefore, wholly belonged to Him. In a normal peace offering it would have been all poured upon the altar as dedicated to God. This gives force to the statement in Leviticus, " I have given the blood to you upon the altar to make atonement for your souls; for it is the blood that maketh atonement by reason of the life." The blood was, in fact, God's share, but it was given back by Him to man as a means of Divine cleansing.

This is important, because it removes altogether the idea that God was to be propitiated by the sprinkled blood. The propitiation comes from Him, and He does not require an atoning gift from man at all. It is also important to realise that the basis of the idea that the blood cleansed the defiled must be sought in the old magical one of contagious virtue in holiness. It is not at all probable that this primitive interpretation was retained by the Levitical legislators, even if it were held by the more superstitious of the laity. The sin offering became symbolical like the rest, but it must have symbolised, if it was to be intelligible, God's gift to man of cleansing and grace or favour, and not a vicarious death, or human penitence, or any other offering from man to God. The sprinkling of the blood was upon the object to be cleansed, and not before God to win His favour; and this is especially, and explicitly, true of the sprinkling in the holy of holies on the Day of Atonement. If we are to carry on the language of this symbolism into the still higher region of Christian doctrine, the sprinkling of the Blood of Christ cannot be a different thing from our union with Christ, but is simply a metaphorical mode of expressing that very union.

What is still more remarkable is that while Baptism comes to us from the most attenuated form of piaculum, the Holy Communion takes us back to the most primitive and realistic of all—the drinking of the Blood. It is the last symbol

that a Jewish teacher would have employed. Nothing could be more abhorrent to Jewish ears. Nothing, however, could better express the fullness and the inwardness of the union which Christ promises; and if, as some suppose, the shrinking from blood arose from a dread of absorbing another's personality, nothing could more forcibly suggest the truth, that what the Christian needs is really a personal union with Christ. "Christ in you, the hope of glory," says St. Paul; and again, "I live no longer, but Christ liveth in me."

LECTURE III

THE SACRIFICE OF GOD

"God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto Himself, not reckoning unto them their trespasses."—2 Cor. v. 19.

I

THE rationality of a belief in the Incarnation is far greater than men of our age are disposed to think. If indeed we hold that the nature of God is Love, it follows, as we have seen, almost as a corollary to be deductively demonstrated. For love means the desire for union and cannot be perfected except by union. If love is the first cause of the universe, its goal must be to be taken into union with the loving God. The question which is still left undetermined, is simply whether human personality is capable of being the point of contact. Has the evolution of the universe progressed so far that its final stage, the actual taking of it into God, has arrived?

It is not, for really thoughtful minds, a difficulty if the true union of the human and the divine has taken place, first of all, at a single point in history. Only the superficial complain of the long delay before the advent of the Divine Man, or of the gradual and slow methods by which mankind is

being made to partake of His benefits. On the scale of the universe man's history is a short one, and the Christian age so far but as a moment. And gradual development from a centre is the customary mode in which evolution works. When life (for example) first appeared in the world it was a new thing, however it was produced. Never before had there been in the whole world a substance that could assimilate food or reproduce itself. It was a very simple and lowly life, and it existed at first only at one spot, but from it has been formed the whole living world of to-day in all its beauty and variety. Similarly, at a later date, there was for the first time a feeling, in a world which up to then had never felt anything. It was one very primitive feeling—of light or warmth or hunger—but it was the beginning of a development that led to the most complicated æsthetic enjoyment. The first man marked a still more wonderful new beginning. For the first time on earth a creature said "I am," and "I ought," and the world became aware of something greater than itself—the natural divined the supernatural. The Incarnation is thus in line with the universal method of the Creator. For though itself unique and supremely miraculous, it was not an event isolated and complete in itself. It was the beginning of the regeneration of humanity. God was made Man that man might be made Divine. The new development had of course its own laws. In

animal progress heredity is all-powerful. In human progress imitation and education bulk more largely. In regeneration they are from the earthly side supreme, while in addition to them and above them is the continuous and direct Divine action which we call grace. But it is one Lord that worketh all in all.

Regeneration is not, however, so purely spiritual that the bodies of men are unaffected by it, unless we suppose that all material existence is, in the purposes of God, only a scaffolding for the building of the spiritual world, and to be cast off when its end is accomplished. If that were so there would have been, perhaps, no need for the Incarnation; but such a theory, making man the only really important part of all the universe so far as it is known to us, is exactly what the modern world cannot believe. The love of God is for all that He created, and all is to be perfected in Him, and therefore God must take our whole personality to Himself if He takes any of it, and the Incarnation is the expression of that fact.

We have a right to claim that the Incarnation is so truly harmonious with our best conceptions of God and the world that the burden of proof rests upon those who take the negative side, and all we need to do is to meet objections against it. They are inevitably three—from the nature of the creature, from the nature of God, and from the nature of the asserted union.

It may be said that material nature is not *capax deitatis*. How can Deity be united with inert matter? But is nature truly material, or is that only a superficial representation of how it appears to us? The materialistic view of the world is disproved by its complete inability to account for an admitted fact, the mysterious union of body with mind. The conception which would deny that it is *capax deitatis* makes it equally impossible that it should be *capax humanitatis*. Materialism is forced either to deny the reality of mind, which, after all, is the one reality of which we are immediately conscious, or else it has to commit suicide by admitting into matter itself a mental or spiritual nature. Once grant that all matter has a mind aspect, and there is no defence against the idealist view that the mind aspect is the very reality of its being.

To a theist the superficial theory which believes in matter because it accepts as ultimate the revelation of sense, should be impossible. If the world of science is the ultimately real world, what becomes of it? Science has no doubt. Our world, and all worlds similarly, are slowly dying by the radiation of heat. Dissipation of energy is the law of the universe. Puerile attempts have been made, as by Haeckel, to avoid the only possible conclusion, by insisting on the very probable collision of dying worlds and their consequent re-birth. But in such collisions there is no regaining of energy already

lost. There is only the transformation into usable form of the remnant which the colliding bodies still possess. The dissipation goes on incessantly, even at the very moment of collision, and such events are only like the sparks that burst into flame in the embers of a slowly dying fire. Who can bear to think of the dead universe, dark and cold and dreadful, most awful of all in its incapacity for decay? Is the end of all things eternal uselessness? The theist at least dare not say so. And yet this is the inevitable result of supposing that the universe is really material in its ultimate constitution. If we believe in God we shall believe that, somehow or other, He will intervene, by some great Advent of Himself, before the final hour of death arrives, and so change the course of events that life will result instead. Or more advisedly we shall say that in the nature of the universe there is a spirituality which is not fully expressed in the laws of energy, and the development of which will lead to quite a different issue than that which science contemplates.

This is in harmony with the New Testament view of the destiny of the material universe. Its clearest teaching is given in the Epistle to the Romans—

"The earnest expectation of the creation waiteth for the revealing of the sons of God. For the creation was subjected to vanity, not of its own will, but by reason of Him who subjected it, in hope that the creation itself also shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the liberty of the glory of the children of God."

St. Paul is almost modern in his description of matter by its characteristic corruptibility, its incessant changefulness and decay. The bondage of corruption, inseparable from material existence, is to come to an end, in an existence which, being incorruptible, cannot be material. The passage quoted does not stand alone. It is supported by such statements as that Christ is the first-born of all creation, and through Him all things are to be reconciled to God, whether things upon the earth or things in the heavens. The corruptible must put on incorruption. The mortal must put on immortality. St. John's vision culminates in a new heaven and a new earth, and the Second Epistle of St. Peter has a detailed picture of the fiery change that is to pass over the universe, out of which the Christian expects new heavens and a new earth to arise wherein dwelleth righteousness. If we are to have a place in the new creation, it seems to follow that the new world must supply us with bodies. That is to say, that just as my body now is a portion of the present world specially appropriated to me and made to be the connecting link between me and the material environment, so some element of the new world will be specially mine and the means by which I correspond with all the rest. The continuity supposed between the two creations justifies us in still describing this hope as the resurrection of the body. Again, the resurrection of our Lord's Body means that It has already

become what the universe is destined finally to become. It is the beginning of the spiritual creation.

The view of the world which we have outlined, whether or not we develop the description into a pluralistic philosophy, forbids us to persevere in that contempt for material things which has been strangely characteristic of Christianity. Doctrines of asceticism which long held sway were repudiated by the Protestant reformers only to be replaced by an equally untrue doctrine of man's total depravity. Later evangelicism, laying less stress on that opinion, though not very definitely abjuring it, has been distinguished by a hatred of worldliness in life and of externalism in worship. It is the nemesis upon these age-long errors when men reject the Incarnation because they cannot understand the dignity, or in a sense the immortality, the spiritual possibilities, of God's material creation. We ought, from our own experience, to be able to avoid the mistake. If we ourselves can hold and dominate our bodies, why should not the Divine Personality be more capable of establishing such a vital bond? The analogy is imperfect, but good as far as it goes. "As the reasonable soul and flesh is one man : so God and man is one Christ."

If, now, some one objects that the Incarnation is impossible because the Infinite cannot be shut up in a finite being, we must answer that, in the first place, such an objection fails to appreciate the

doctrine of the Incarnation. All along we have said, " not by conversion of the Godhead into flesh, but by taking of the manhood into God." That is to say, we have never believed that the Infinite one so entered into the human nature of Christ, as to be exclusively there and no longer anywhere else. We have meant that the human nature was so taken into God as to be the sphere and vehicle of an experience which was personally His. God took that Body to be His Body as my body is mine. In it He experienced as His own the pains of hunger, weariness and death. And also He learned and thought and remembered by means of a human mind. He willed and loved—with all the sorrows and disappointments and frustrations of a love not returned—by means of a human spirit. He took the whole manhood into God, and therefore man, looking upon that manhood, saw God's manhood; and, listening, heard God speak in it. To say that God cannot do this is not honouring to God, and it is not sensible, or even plausible. For creation, the activity which we most confidently ascribe to God, is also self-limitation. It involves for God the experience of an other-than-self, and that a finite other. The existence of a world in space and time makes space and time somehow real to Him, though He is not Himself in them, and they are to Him, doubtless, quite unlike what they seem to us. If evolution is really anything at all but a figment of the finite mind, God works

gradually and in time. And if will is in us a truly originating power and not an unaccountably obstinate delusion, God has created creatures able even to contradict His purposes. Instead of denying that God can so limit Himself as to act within, and from within, a finite sphere, which is the meaning of the Incarnation, it would be wiser to confess that the Incarnation is the natural climax of all that we know of His activity.

And so we come to the last objection, which Eucken may describe to us as well as another.

"The meeting of Godhead and mankind in one person—of two natures in one life—cannot be more closely defined without a destruction of the balance between the two and the suppression or the annihilation of the one factor by the other. Either the 'very God' destroys the 'very man' and reduces the manhood to a mere semblance, or the 'very man' destroys the 'very God' and the Godhead is understood as merely an exalted humanity. The Church could of course decree that the two natures were one, but it did not thereby make the doctrine conceivable, or invest it with any vital power. Even such as hold aloof from all ultimate questions can easily see that a human life invested with the consciousness of the Divine nature and dignity could never fully share the sorrows and needs of human existence. It would know nothing of man's heaviest burden, his groping and wandering, his doubt and uncertainty, and the way in which all his doings seem to be swallowed up in an impenetrable world" (*Can we still be Christians?* p. 30).

We have not been left to imagine for ourselves what God in man would be like and what His

behaviour would be. Some of our race have looked upon Him, heard Him, and handled Him, and their impressions have been preserved for us to read. One thing is immediately plain—that Eucken's idea of what the God-man must be is amply justified. It really is an important feature of the Gospel narratives that in them Christ knows nothing of doubt and uncertainty, of groping and wandering, and never thinks that His doings can be swallowed up in an impenetrable world. Eucken's and other men's objection involves the assumption that God in man, to be really man, must live a human life exactly like our own. Now the witness of the Gospels is that Christ's life was markedly different from ours. "Never man spake like this man." "What manner of man is this Whom even the winds and the sea obey?" "We beheld His glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father." And if we do not grant the assumption, the objection falls to the ground.

II

Some one has said that if any great hero of our race entered a room where a number of us were sitting, we should all rise up to receive him with due honour, but if our Lord Jesus Christ entered we should fall upon our knees. That is the impression with which an unbiassed reader of the Gospels is left, because it is the one which the Evangelists had themselves received. Jesus went

before, and as the Apostles followed they were afraid. They had a question in their minds and were afraid to ask Him. They found that He knew of their disputes by the way, and were silent and ashamed before His still unspoken reproof. Metaphorically they were always on their knees. This is the reason that we read without surprise of His passing unharmed through the midst of an angry crowd or of the officers' failure to arrest Him. It is the Gospels in their totality that give us the impression of His unique grandeur, but we may glance at some particular passages. There is no need to dwell upon that self-assertion which has been so often used to prove that He made Divine claims. How much of it was involved in the belief that He was the Messiah need not be asked. But it is remarkable that One in Whom there was no trace of self-assertiveness, should possess a belief about Himself implying such self-assertion. If He could not be the Messiah without establishing a Kingdom of God, without giving a law that superseded that of Moses, without dying for the ransom of mankind, without being yet the final Judge before Whom all nations and all men must stand—how did He Who was meek and lowly of heart arrive at the conclusion that He was called to such an office? His sinlessness has been called a moral miracle. His claim is no less a psychological one.

Consider, in connection with this, His choice for

Himself of the title—Son of Man. It was perhaps Messianic, but the point is that of all the possible Messianic titles, it was the one oftenest used by Himself, and least often by His disciples. Both sides of the fact are to be remembered. Any minimising of the significance of His use of it, by supposing it to have been in common use, must conflict with the marked refusal of the early Christians to employ it when they spoke of Him. Must not the true explanation be that to Him His manhood was a thing so extraordinary that Son of Man was the most descriptive of titles? It was a matter of course that He was Son of God, the Lord's anointed —His own self-consciousness told Him that—but that He was also Son of man was in His mind most wonderful.

For I believe that our modern " Lives of Christ " are all astray in their endeavour to trace the gradual development in Christ of a knowledge of His own Divinity. Certainly, as we have said, His consciousness was always mediated by a human organism. His condescension carried Him even below the level at which there is any consciousness at all, and in His Eternal Godhead He was not ignorant even of His own conception. But we speak of a self-consciousness from within the human nature which He assumed. As an infant He must, therefore, have been as entirely unconscious of self as any human infant, and like others He reached self-consciousness through opposition to the non-

ego, the environing objects of sense and thought. In human fashion He—

> " Gathers much
> And learns the use of ' I ' and ' me,'
> And finds, ' I am not what I see
> And other than the things I touch.' "

But when self-consciousness is attained it is a Divine self-consciousness. Exactly as I come to say " I am human," He came to say " I am God." It is for this reason that when we meet Him in relation with the world around, He faces it not as the artist, with a delight in its æsthetic stimulations, or as the student, anxious to probe its secrets, or even as the statesman and philanthropist, devoting Himself to plans for its government and amelioration, but always as its Saviour and its Lord. At what age this self-consciousness was reached we have not been told. It seems to be already fully formed when at twelve years old no occupation seemed possible but the things of His Father. Nothing could be more boy-like than the mind which can scarcely be patient with the incapacity of older folk to see what is so transparently plain to itself. All boys are like that. But the contents of His mind—the thing which is so plain—is unique. " How is it that ye sought Me? Did you not know that I *must* be in my Father's house? "

The passage has more to teach us. Our Lord seems never to have thought of Himself as one man among the many, one link in the chain of human

lives. The most original of men acknowledge parentage and blood-relationships. Christ turns away from them. Surely this is implied in His quiet correction of His Mother's, "Thy father and I." One is His Father. It might have been only a knowledge that Joseph was His foster-father, were it not obvious from other passages that in His childhood He did not refuse the name of father to Joseph. Plainly in Nazareth He had been known to men as Jesus, the Son of Joseph! But in a moment of especial exaltation, when the supreme truth about Himself was filling His consciousness, the accustomed human usage struck a wrong note. On another such occasion He spoke similarly of her who truly was His Mother. When He is told that His Mother and His brethren stand without desiring to speak to Him, He answers, "My Mother and My brethren are these that hear the word of God." In other words, human ties of blood confer no claim upon His attention. He does not belong to any family, but founds a new one, the bond of which is spiritual—a new family, or rather, a new humanity. It is not much more decisive when He says, if we accept St. John, that His brethren are of this world, while He is not of this world.

But it is especially when we examine Christ's references to the Heavenly Father that His Divine self-consciousness becomes apparent. What is impressive is the quiet matter-of-course way in which He speaks. Where God and man are set over

against one another He ranges Himself with God and not with man. He makes no claim. He simply assumes a fact that is to Him obvious. So, for instance, we have the famous passage beginning, "No man knoweth the Son save the Father." We have Him distinguished from men and angels, and higher than they, in His confession of ignorance about the day of His coming. We have His habitual use of "My Father," and of "your Father," but never of "Our Father." Again He makes Himself parallel with the Father and separated from mankind when He says, "Call no man your Father on the earth: for one is your Father, which is in Heaven. Neither be ye called masters: for one is your Master, even the Christ." In the parable of the wicked husbandmen the prophets, greatest of mankind, are servants, but He Himself is the only Son.

Undoubtedly the effect of all such passages is to separate our Lord from us, and that separation He felt Himself. Very quickly He became aware of His approaching rejection. He was sowing seed in hard pathways, and among thorns and in rocky places. To some few only could the mystery of the Kingdom be given, while the others stood outside. But even of the twelve He had to complain, "Are ye also so without understanding?" or even, "Have I been so long time with you and yet hast thou not known me, Philip?" The loneliness of Christ is more than that which is the lot of every great teacher or leader. And perhaps there is

something of surprise in the glad welcome of His, "Blessed art thou, Simon," which was His response to St. Peter's confession. Yet the loneliness deepened as the time went on. "O wicked and perverse generation, how long shall I be with you?" "How am I straitened till my Baptism be accomplished?"

We may say that Christ ever felt Himself to be God, but found it hard to realise that He was man. Throughout the ministry He was unable to adopt a perfectly human attitude towards other men or towards God. He is not at home in this life of ours as we are—not comfortable, we might say, in the humanity He has assumed. And therefore we must confess that the union of God and man has not yet in the fullest sense been accomplished. Here is the Lord indeed in the substance of true man taken of the blessed Virgin His Mother, and in it He does indeed think and feel, as well as act, entirely as a man, but He has not altogether made it all His own. The mere taking of our nature was not enough. In that sense the Incarnation did not fulfil the purpose of His coming—the bringing of creation into union with God. Indeed, if it had done so, redemption would have been a mere quasi-physical process, and we are sure, and rightly so, that the union of God and man had to be also a moral and spiritual union. We may illustrate what we mean from the other side. We mean by our union with God more than a physical or metaphysical change. We mean, if the union is perfect,

as in this world it can scarcely be, that our thoughts, remaining ours and determined by our personality, are yet always a thinking of God's thoughts after Him; that the emotional stimuli which shake or kindle us are always godly motions; that our conscience distinguishes right and wrong with God's finality; that our wills, remaining ours, reach perfect freedom by being made His. Now, as our union with God must bear fruit in such godliness, so His with us must be made perfect in manliness. It is not complete until in the depths of His self-consciousness He knows Himself as human, until His outlook on His environment is a truly human one.

There are indications that the union with our humanity which we miss in the record of the ministry is exactly what Christ accomplished in His Passion. Only three or four sayings display the humanising of His Personality, and they may seem to be a slight foundation to build so much upon. We do not, in fact, rely upon them to prove the successful achievement of His great enterprise in our behalf. The proof of the atonement is the descent of the Holy Spirit, and the regeneration which His abiding presence has ever since been effecting in the world. But what we are now attempting to show is that the atonement results from the perfecting of Christ's union with us by His Death. And if our texts are few they are peculiarly full of meaning—and after all, not so very few, considering the small number

of Christ's recorded utterances during these great hours.

In our Lord's prayer in the garden of Gethsemane He alludes to His possession of a will distinct from that of the Father. "Not as I will but as Thou wilt." "Not My will but Thine be done." This has ever been the Catholic stronghold against the heresy which denies Christ's true humanity. It has rightly been judged to display a human will in Christ. There was of course no conflict between it and the will of God, which would have been sin. The human will resigns itself wholly to God, but resignation, which is a virtue and not a sin, is distinctly the virtue of a creature. Hitherto in Christ we have seen a serene identification with the Father's will. His meat and drink has been to do the will of the Father Who sent Him. But now by no effort can He preserve the identity, and really will, as an act of His own Personality, to go to the Cross. Only by an agony of effort can He attain to the surrender of will, and so will that His own will shall not be done. This is entirely human. And the Epistle to the Hebrews so describes the spiritual meaning of Gethsemane. Then it was that He offered up prayers and supplications with strong crying and tears to Him that was able to save Him from, or out of, death. He was heard for His godly fear—that is, says Westcott, for "the submission which is obedience on one side and fellowship on the other," an attitude describing a humanly

religious spirit. So, though He was Son, He learned obedience by the things which He suffered. He did not have to learn that Divine "subjection" which He eternally manifests within the Unity of the blessed Trinity, but He had to learn what it was to yield a creature's obedience. It was a more deeply personal human experience than He had ever had before. And it was, therefore, being made perfect by suffering, that He became the cause of eternal salvation to all them that obey Him.

There is another possible reference to Gethsemane—possible, if we accept the early date for St. Mark which has recently been defended by more than one commentator—in St. Paul's use of the phrase, "Abba, Father." With these words, according to St. Mark, Christ's prayer in the garden began. They have plainly some profound association in St. Paul's mind. In the two passages where he uses them he is speaking of Christians as sons of God through fellowship in the Sonship of Christ. "Ye received the spirit of adoption whereby we cry, Abba, Father." "Because ye are sons God sent forth the Spirit of His Son into our hearts, crying, Abba, Father." If the suggestion does come from the Gospel, it implies that the Apostle regarded the Sonship displayed in Gethsemane, as specially that human sonship of which He makes us also to be partakers.

The second occasion on which our Lord speaks out of a human self-consciousness is the fourth word

from the Cross, " My God, My God, why hast Thou forsaken Me? " Much has been written about the mystery of dereliction of which no discussion is here necessary, but on any interpretation it involves a sense of personal distinctness from God. The " Me " that is forsaken by the " Thou " does not denote merely the Second Person of the Blessed Trinity, for the feeling of being other than God, and even separated from Him, is in possession of the Speaker's mind. And if the cry itself is that of a creature, still more plainly is the address, " My God." Hitherto God has always been for our Lord, " My Father." Now only has He learned to speak to Him as if to a faithful Creator, that is to say, with a truly human voice.

It seems certain that the proximate cause of the dereliction was the approach of death. The failure of the organism through which, in the sphere of His humanity, Christ held communion with the Father, necessitated the interruption of that communion, and we must remember that it had been for Him, most probably—most certainly, so far as we trust ourselves to speculate—a hitherto unbroken sense of union, not, as for us, an experience deliberately entered into and renewed from time to time. We recall Eucken's picture of the impossible humanity of the God-man. " He would know nothing of man's heaviest burden, his groping and wandering, his doubt and uncertainty, and the way in which all his doings seem to be swallowed up in

an impenetrable world." It appears that the impossible did once become actual for Christ. He is bewildered and lost, deprived of that consciousness of God which has ever been the interpretation of life to Him, and we may add that apparently " His doings," that is to say, His life-work of redeeming the world from sin, did " seem for the moment to be swallowed up in an impenetrable world." Face to face with the world's sin which had concentrated itself upon Him, and deprived of the vision of the Father—united with man in the bonds of a humanity that had no hope and was without God in the world—to Him sin for that hour appeared to be victorious and the world to be impenetrable, unsaveable. " He bare our sins in His own Body on the tree." " God made Him to be sin for us, Who knew no sin." It is in this awful experience, not by His Birth, but by His Death, that Christ entered into the full fellowship of our human nature.

Once we grasp this truth the New Testament becomes full of confirmatory witness. For instance, the two great sacraments are sacraments of our union with Christ. In the one we are baptised into His Body, we put on Christ. In the other we eat His Flesh and drink His Blood. Yet both are sacraments of His Death. All who are baptised into Christ are baptised into His Death and are buried with Him by baptism into death. In the Eucharist we proclaim His Death till He come. On

the other hand He describes His Death in terms which recall the sacraments. "Are ye able to drink of the cup that I shall drink of, and to be baptised with the baptism that I am baptised with?" Each of the figures reappears elsewhere separately. It is as if the Cross were the sacrament of Christ's union with our nature, and so the foundation of the sacraments by which we are united with His. Before we could be baptised into Christ He must be baptised into humanity. Before we could drink His cup of salvation, He must drink our cup of wrath and staggering.

The union with us effected by the Death of Christ is an abiding union. After the Resurrection Christ uses again the name "My God" which He learned upon the Cross. "Go unto my brethren," He says, "and say unto them, I ascend to my Father and your Father, and my God and your God." In this solemn charge He also recognises our fellowship with Himself. Even now He may not say, "Our Father and our God." For God is eternally Father to Him in another sense than He can be to us. And the Father is God to us in another sense than He can be to the Eternal Son. But both names are true on our lips and on His. Here also for the first time the disciples are familiarly addressed as His brethren. Christ had always what we may call an intellectual apprehension of that relationship. He had said, "Behold My Mother and My brethren," as if He were imparting a great truth. There had

been a promise of so addressing them in His vision of the Judgment Day. " Inasmuch as ye have done it unto the least of these My brethren." But in actual intercourse He had not gone further than calling them friends, and even to this he draws attention as to a privilege, " Henceforth I call you not servants, but I have called you friends." After the Passion in which He realised His Humanity He could say, " Go unto My brethren."

It was, then, by His Death and only by His Death that Christ became in the fullest sense " very man " as well as " very God." What did He thereupon have to do, in His perfected Humanity, to save us from our sins? The only possible answer, I think, is that there was no more to do. Certainly, on any view of the Atonement, there was still the harvesting of the world. What Christ had made possible by His Death had to become the real possession of individual men. But that is a subject which does not yet occupy us. The foundation itself, the payment of the ransom, the redemption, the sacrifice—all is accomplished when Christ became perfectly Man. For what indeed could there be to add to His work when He had at last taken the manhood into God? *Consummatum est.* God-made-man inaugurates the last stage of the history of the universe. From that union flow the powers which are to regenerate the world, and first and especially mankind, and carry it on into the perfect and eternal world to come. God-made-man does

not have to do anything else to reconcile the world. He *is* the Atonement by being God-made-man.

This, we think, would have been observed long since, had it not been that in the New Testament the Atonement is so definitely ascribed to the Cross, while the union with us seems to be so obviously the immediate result of Christ's conception and birth. Once we see that the Incarnation needed to be accomplished in the psychical and spiritual realm, and that this resulted not from the mere possession of a human organism, but from the experience of death, we can understand that redemption by the Incarnation means redemption by the Cross. Hence we understand the emphasis, the extraordinary emphasis as it has always seemed, which the Epistle to the Hebrews lays upon the likeness to us in all things, without which Christ could not be our merciful and faithful High Priest or destroy the power of the devil. It is no longer extraordinary when we see that it was not only a preliminary qualification of the Saviour, but actually the work by which He saves us.

III

It is necessary to show that this view of the Atonement, suggested by the Gospels, is in harmony with the more directly doctrinal portions of the New Testament. The Atonement provides, upon any theory of it, two problems. We have to give a

satisfactory account of what the Cross itself meant, and then to show how the benefits of the Cross become available for individual men. The former being our main subject at present, it will be found that the scriptural statements to be dealt with may be grouped under four main doctrines.

1. Christ bore our sins in His own Body.
2. Christ by His Death offered Himself to God as a sacrifice for men.
3. By the Death of Christ we receive forgiveness of sins.
4. By the Death of Christ we were redeemed or ransomed—bought with a price.

In the first place we must consider Christ as the Sin-bearer. The strongest statement is 2 Cor. v. 21 : " Him Who knew no sin He made to be sin on our behalf : that we might become the righteousness of God in Him." With this we must compare 1 St. Pet. ii. 24 : " Who His own self bare our sins in His own Body on the tree," and Heb. ix. 28 : " Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many." The meaning is, says Dr. Plummer, that, " in some sense which we cannot fathom, God is said to have identified Christ with man's sin, in order that man might be identified with God's own righteousness. The relationship expressed by " Christ in us and we in Him " is part of the solution. It is by union of Christ with man that Christ is identified with human sin, and it is by union of man with Christ that man

is identified with Divine righteousness." More fully Dr. Mason has described the sin-bearing in an eloquent passage (*Faith of the Gospel*, p. 202)—

"All through life Christ had been made to bear the loathsome pressure of other men's sins encompassing Him. But during all that time He stood in some measure aloof from them; they were kept, so to speak, at arm's length, and regarded as external to Himself, the sins of others. It was His Death which made the union with men complete. In His Death, those sins, from which every fibre of His being revolted with indignation and dismay, were brought home to His inmost conscience, in the realisation that He and we were one. It was not for Him to plead calmly and condescendingly for us from his superior height of conscious integrity, but to appropriate us and all our vileness, in order to deal with it as it deserved within the very sphere of His own holy being."

There follows a statement, on the lines of Moberly's theory of atonement by penitence, that our sin, having been laid upon Christ, was expiated by "the thoroughness with which Christ's broken heart admitted it, grieved over it and repudiated it." It is characteristic of Western theories of the Atonement to view the sin-bearing as the necessary preliminary to the essential act of sacrifice. This is an addition to New Testament teaching, for the Apostles commonly dissociate the two ways of regarding the work of Christ. They give no hint that the offering of Himself for us first became possible to Christ when He had identified Himself with our

sin. Nor is this merely accidental. The Jewish idea of sacrifice did not, as we have seen, involve the transference of sin to the victim. On the contrary, the scapegoat, upon which the sins of the people were laid, was not, and could not be, offered in sacrifice. The victim must be without blemish. That this requirement was present to the minds of the Apostles appears from 1 St. Pet. i. 19: "Ye were redeemed . . . with precious blood as of a lamb without blemish and without spot," and from Heb. ix. 14: "Christ through the Eternal Spirit offered Himself without blemish unto God." Of course the two facts are perfectly consistent, since the sin-bearing left untarnished the perfect personal sinlessness of Christ. But the point is that the sinlessness and not the sin-bearing harmonised with sacrificial conceptions. The modern theories which base the sacrifice upon Christ's previous identification with our sin cannot, therefore, be justly described as scriptural. This becomes still more evident from the one passage in which the two ideas occur together. "Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many." Modern writers say, "Christ bore the sins of many in order to offer Himself for their expiation." The doctrine of the New Testament makes the oblation prior, and even preliminary, to the sin-bearing. It suggests that it consisted in the voluntary self-dedication of Christ to this work, and this agrees with the statement that it was made through the Eternal Spirit, that is,

in His eternal Divine Personality. When the language of sacrifice is discarded it becomes the perfect obedience of the Son to the Father, which justifies the many—an obedience manifested, and even learned, in His human nature, in which He became obedient unto death, but characteristic of the Son eternally. His meat and drink was to do the will of Him that sent Him and to accomplish His work. He did it when all things were made by Him. We may believe that to perfect creation by bringing it into union with God was eternally predestined to be His work. Sin made the perfecting only possible at the cost of suffering even the death on the Cross, and it is especially in His acceptance of that fact and His willingness to endure it that the obedience becomes sacrifice. All the sacrificial language of the New Testament can be understood, without any minimising explanations, in accordance with this conception of it. There is no need to introduce any act of expiation following upon the identification of Christ with human sin. That was in itself the Atonement.

We must affirm this especially of the passages which speak of Christ as the propitiation for our sins. It is remarkable that these do not decisively associate propitiation with Christ's Death. One connects it, if with any particular moment, with the Incarnation. " God loved us and sent His Son (as) the propitiation for our sins " (St. John iv. 10). Another speaks of it as a present fact linked with

His advocacy in Heaven. "He is the propitiation for our sins; and not for ours only, but also for the whole world" (1 St. John ii. 2). Similarly, in Heb. ii. 17, it is connected with the Incarnation and with that priesthood which is His to-day. "Wherefore in all things it behoved Him to be made like unto His brethren, that He might be a merciful and faithful high priest in things pertaining to God, to make propitiation for the sins of the people." Finally, in Rom. iii. 25, we are told that "God set Him forth as a propitiation, through faith in His Blood . . . for the showing of His righteousness at this present season." The concluding words show plainly that His setting forth is a lasting and present fact. The truth is that to a Jewish mind propitiation was something provided by God for man, not something offered by man to God. The blood of the sin offering was indeed offered to God—as Christ offered Himself through His Eternal Spirit. But it became propitiatory when God gave it back to man, and it was effective by being sprinkled on the person or thing to be cleansed. Christ did not, then, propitiate God on the Cross, but His Blood there shed became for man a blood of sprinkling through which, now and at all times, we may be cleansed from sin. There is, of course, a sense in which it may be said to propitiate God, inasmuch as it is His righteousness that establishes our uncleanness and makes the cleansing necessary. The Death of Christ saved

the whole world, although salvation needs to be appropriated. In that sense God may be said to be propitiated by the Death of Christ, because thereby the propitiation was provided for all, although it is not until we are washed that we cease to be children of wrath and become children of grace. Nevertheless it is as the source of all cleansing and grace that Christ is the propitiation for the whole world—not as given to God, but as the gift of God to man.

So we come to the further point that by His Death Christ won for us the forgiveness of sins. He could only do this in two ways, either by changing the mind of God from the desire or the necessity of punishing sin, to the will or power to forgive sin; or else by changing the nature of men so that they become fit subjects for forgiveness, as they had not hitherto been. We must accept the second alternative, for although the first has been the basis of well-known theories of atonement, it involves insuperable difficulties. There is the initial one that the whole work of salvation is attributed in the New Testament to the love of God. That love, it is said, is consistent with the will to punish, and so it would be with even the most severe disciplinary punishment. But what the Bible speaks of is not discipline, but an antagonism that, apart from Christ, demands eternal banishment of the sinner from the presence of God. If God desired that He did not love us. If, on the other

hand, it was a necessity, arising out of our sin and contrary to the will of God, then the love of God is seen in delivering us from it. But that could not be by freeing Himself from a compulsion to punish, which is an intolerable idea, but by freeing us from the bondage which sin imposed. In other words, we are driven to abandon the alternative we proposed, of a change in the mind of God. The same result follows from observing that Christ's death did not simply save us, but provided a salvation for those who accept it, by faith and baptism and patient continuance in well-doing. Without going into details we see that a change in us is required, and unless it can be shown that the change wrought in us by Christ does not suffice to make possible our forgiveness, there is no object in also postulating a change in God's mind towards us. We must guard ourselves, however, from supposing that all that was needed was to awaken men to love of God and hatred of sin, to give them a new motive to holiness, or even additional grace for its attainment. The Atonement was objective. It did really change our relation towards God and His relation towards us. It inaugurated a new era. It did not merely open our eyes to an already existing way of life.

There is an element of unreality in most modern theories of atonement which discard the anthropomorphic transactions between the Father and the Son imagined by Anselm and Calvin, and yet adhere

to the fundamental Western idea of propitiating God. When we are told that the Cross is the "vindication" of God's holiness, or an act of "representative" penitence, or the "expression" and "revelation" of the eternal law of righteousness, we feel that we are half-way to a subjective view of it. Is the unreality avoidable? Or shall we say with Sanday and Headlam, "All mercy, all forgiveness, is of the nature of fiction. It consists in treating men better than they deserve. And if we 'being evil' exercise the property of mercy towards each other, and exercise it not rarely out of consideration for the merit of some one else than the offender, shall not our Heavenly Father do the same?" Surely that is but a superficial view of forgiveness. When my brother sins against me and I forgive him, it is because he is, after all, my brother. The sin does not express our whole relationship. To behave towards him on the basis solely of his offence would be to ignore the much more important elements of the truth about us—our common blood, our childhood companionship, our many mutual services, the natural love which I hope is still in him in spite of his sin, as it certainly is in me. When I forgive an offender for the sake of one who pleads his cause I do so because, while to me he is an offender, to the other he is dear, and his value in his advocate's eyes outweighs, even in my eyes, his offence. I would rather let him go free than be the cause of pain to one whom I honour

and perhaps love. Shall not our Heavenly Father do the same? Unless He finds us wholly expressed in our sin, so that the image of Himself in us is blotted out;—unless we have become totally unfit to have a place in His presence—will there not be a place for forgiveness? That, as a matter of fact, we have become very largely unfit, and quite unable of ourselves to reach the further glory for which He destined us, is indeed the cause of the Cross. Even we cannot forgive without pain to ourselves, without doing a certain violence to ourselves. Certainly God could not ignore sin. He had to endure it on the Cross. But at that cost He could forgive. For what He effected on the Cross was to inaugurate that union of us with Himself which is at once the destined further glory of our race, and the only means by which we can be delivered from sin and be made partakers of His holiness. Unworthy though we are of the union, He grants it, and thereby establishes a new relation which justifies it. For according to the New Testament the basis of our forgiveness is not that a satisfaction has been made for us, or our punishment borne for us, but that we are in Christ. "There is no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus." "If any man be in Christ he is a new creature." Those who are ignorant of God's righteousness and seek to establish their own, fail, says St. Paul, to arrive at it. But the Apostle's aim has been "to gain Christ and to be found in

Him, not having a righteousness of my own, but that which is through faith in Christ, the righteousness that is of God by faith." So he lives no longer, but Christ lives in him, and to him to live is Christ. It is a thought which pervades the whole teaching of the Epistles. What Christ did on the Cross was to make it possible for men to be in Him. How better shall we express what he needed to do than by the old saying, "God was made Man that man might be made Divine?" But we must insist on the necessity of the first act of the redemptive work. Man could not be in Christ until Christ was constituted the second Adam, the Head of redeemed humanity. "It was His Death that made the union with man complete." He could only offer to us the new birth of water and the spirit when He Himself had been baptised into our nature by the shedding of His Blood. "This is He that came by water and blood, even Jesus Christ; not with the water only, but with the water and with the blood. And it is the Spirit that beareth witness because the Spirit is the truth. For there are three who bear witness, the spirit and the water and the blood : and the three agree in one."

It will now have become clear that our view of the Atonement which makes it to consist simply in the full union of Christ with us, the complete taking of the manhood into God, is wholly objective. It is more free from subjectivism than any of the theories which prevail among us. Man is

very loath to abandon all thought of saving himself. If he is driven to believe that he needs salvation, he would like to hold, with the subjectivist, that he only requires teaching and the incitement to greater effort and higher ideals. If he learns by experience that he must ask God to do more than that for him, he would at least believe in atonement by the Man who is the flower of manhood and the representative of the race. That Christ as Man and for men offers to God a human penitence, a human obedience, a human merit and a human pain, and is accepted for all His people because of the merit of His oblation, leaves man with something still to glory in. But the truth is rather, we believe, that the Atonement is wholly the work of God. The sacrifice and the obedience were Divine. The Saviour did not become man in order to suffer, but suffered in order to become man. Our human part in the work is the pain we have inflicted upon Him. The race, like the individual, must come to God confessing, "Nothing in my hand I bring." Salvation is the free gift of God. "God was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself, not reckoning unto them their trespasses."

It does not seem that this view of the Atonement will lessen our sense of the sinfulness of sin. It should indeed deliver us from the spirit of bondage and fearfulness, seeing that for our sakes God spared not His own Son. It should convince us of

the infinite love of God which makes no demands, but forgives freely. It should lead us to true contrition, a sorrow for love's sake, and not from dread of punishment or fear of loss or the shame that is born of pride.

When we turn to those passages in which the work of Christ is described as a redemption we find ourselves in a new circle of ideas having, like that of sacrifice, an Old Testament origin. Redemption began in the sphere of ordinary human intercourse as the buying back of land, or the ransom of persons, especially from slavery. It was used, by metaphor, of the deliverances which God wrought for Israel. The typical instance was the exodus from Egypt, and it was as a second, and in some respects greater, exodus that the prophets who foretold the return from Babylon spoke of it as a redemption and called God the Redeemer of Israel. Naturally the element of payment almost disappeared, and the cost to God was expressed rather as a putting forth of His mighty power—as, so to speak, an exercise of Divine effort. "The Lord is a man of war," was the song of Moses. In this way preparation was made for the New Testament description of the Divine enterprise of Christ as a Redemption of the world. It was no longer necessary, for the suitability of the metaphor, to picture the paying over of the ransom to the tyrant who held the redeemed in bondage. Our salvation was redemption, if God procured it by

the strength of His right hand and at cost to Himself. The redeeming blood of Christ was thus primarily the Warrior's blood, shed in the great conflict for us. But other aspects of the work could not but enter into this description of it also. Men, it must be remembered, were not innocent victims of Satan, but had consented to his temptations. They needed cleansing and forgiveness as much as rescue, and that also must be obtained through the blood of Christ. This thought is prominent in 1 St. Pet. i. 18, 19: "We were redeemed, not with corruptible things, with silver and gold, from your vain manner of life handed down from your fathers; but with precious blood as of a lamb without blemish and without spot, even the blood of Christ." Here the blood is obviously sacrificial, and the only sacrifice which has any connection with a redemption was that of the passover, in which the exodus was commemorated. This therefore we must suppose, with the commentators, to have been in the Apostle's mind. The blood upon the house-doors marked the inmates as people to be redeemed. It was consecrating blood, and it required little imagination to see it as actually redeeming blood—as indeed Jewish writers did. When the paschal lamb becomes a figure of Christ, it reminds us that the blood which He shed in rescuing us, when He gave His life a ransom for many, is also blood of sprinkling by which we are marked, consecrated, purified and

appropriated as His own. But the passover blood was certainly not offered to God, and there is no indication therefore in St. Peter that the blood of Christ was in any sense paid to God for our ransom. It was propitiatory, not in the pagan and modern sense, but in the scriptural sense as given by God to cleanse the defiled.

To the first Christian writers it was even more important that we have been redeemed to God than that we have been redeemed from bondage, and the cleansing of our souls is so great an element in our redemption that it sometimes seems to be the whole of it. Thus redemption becomes synonymous with forgiveness. St. Paul writes (Eph. i. 7): "In whom we have our redemption through His blood, the forgiveness of our trespasses," and we even have the phrase "redemption of," instead of "from," "transgressions" (Heb. ix. 15). It is an example of what commonly occurs in the use of metaphorical language. Salvation from sin was first a redemption because sin is a bondage, but the same word is applied to it when sin is thought of wholly as a defilement, and the salvation needed is a forgiveness instead of a deliverance.

Nevertheless there are many passages in which the state from which we have been redeemed is noticed. It is transgression or a vain manner of life. It is also the power of darkness, which seems to be the same as the power of Satan from which St. Paul was to turn the Gentiles. The form which

this idea took in patristic times is obnoxious to modern minds, but it has a scriptural basis. "The whole world," says St. John, "lieth in the evil one." The tyranny of Satan was a very real fact, and from that Christ by His death delivered us. He was manifested that He might destroy the works of the devil. Through death He brought to nought him that had the power of death, that is, the devil; and delivered all them who through fear of death were all their lifetime subject to bondage.

In one remarkable saying St. Paul varies from the usual description of our bondage. "Christ," he says, "redeemed us from the curse of the law, having become a curse for us: for it is written, Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree" (Gal. iii. 13). We have no right to interpret this to mean that Christ bears the penalty of our sins. St. Paul does not say so, and it is not the sense of the original Deuteronomic text which he quotes. The hanging, far from being appointed by God as a penalty, is spoken of there as a defilement which is abhorrent to God and can only be allowed within narrow limits. The body must be removed before nightfall, "that thou defile not the land." St. Paul means, then, that Christ is identified with our sinfulness. So far as the dereliction on the Cross warrants us, we may say that He experienced what is involved in the wrath of God. But there is no hint that, beyond that, there was in the Crucifixion

any expiatory offering to God, the receiving of which turned away His wrath from us.

Our conclusion is that whether we view the work of Christ as Sacrifice, as sin-bearing or as redemption, it is always a Divine work though done in human nature and by means of it. But man has not saved himself—even in the person of the Head of the race. There has been no self-oblation of humanity, no representative undergoing of the punishment due to sin, and no victory of the race over Satan, of such a kind that we can claim as a right the forgiveness and favour of God. What has been done has been done by God Himself out of His own unquenchable love. In love He had from the beginning made us for Himself. Sin did not destroy His love or move Him from His purpose. He did not reckon to us our trespasses, but they had their consequences, as facts ignored always do. When He passed over our sins to take us to Himself, the sins had to be endured, and they were endured in His passion and crucifixion and death. But the result is victory. The world has been taken into union with God. In the glorified Jesus Christ, in His body and in His spirit, we recognise the beginning of the new creation. And from Him issues the power of the new life, the life of Man-in-God, to kindle in us the life which is God-in-man—Christ in you, the hope of glory. *Tu ad liberandum suscepisti hominem.*

LECTURE IV

SOME THEORIES OF ATONEMENT

"No man may deliver his brother, nor make agreement unto God for him; for it cost more to redeem their souls."—Ps. xlix. 7, 8.

I

For a history of the doctrine of the Atonement in the Christian Church we have no space in these lectures, but it will be useful to examine certain of its broad features by which our own position is illustrated and strengthened. It will tend to clearness if we work back to an understanding of what Christ did, from a consideration of what He had to do; if we begin, that is to say, by describing the purpose of the Atonement and so discover what its nature was. That purpose was, it will be agreed, to solve the great problem of humanity: How can a man be justified with God? The man who has been brought into right relation with God is one who has been enabled to offer to Him an acceptable worship and service. But we must understand that the service which is required from man is more than a life of righteousness, more than the manifestation of the Divine image in man. For the work of God

in creation is not yet complete. Creation is a perpetual becoming, a progress towards the goal of union with the Creator. It needs to be made perfect in the new creation, and man is destined to be an instrument of God in the fulfilment of His eternal purpose. But this purpose is, as St. Paul tells us, "in Christ Jesus our Lord." It is not simply the climax of the natural evolution of all things, but a new creation through the eternal Word. Thus we are driven to the conclusion that the Incarnation, by which the union of the creation with God is to be effected, cannot be regarded simply as an expedient made necessary by sin. Our sin has done no more than modify the conditions under which it came to pass. The lowly birth, the life of toil, the straitening of the Incarnate as He moved to the accomplishment of His work, the agony of it, the sin-bearing and the death—these are the results of sin. But when we consider that Christ effected our regeneration as well as our restoration, we see that His work was not only to make the Atonement necessitated by sin, but also to carry human nature on to a higher glory than that in which it came from God.

The question whether God would have become man apart from sin, which agitated the schools of the mediæval period, did not present itself to the minds of the Fathers. Yet Athanasius and even Irenæus perceived that Christ effected a progress of nature, the end of which is still to be revealed. And we can scarcely doubt that, if they had ex-

pressed an opinion, it would have been that which we hold ourselves. Nevertheless for them, as for the Fathers generally, the restoration of a fallen human race stands out as the sufficient and even the sole purpose of the Incarnation. There is, for us also, little to be gained by dwelling on what might have been. Man has fallen and needs a Saviour.

Our evolutionary view of creation by no means contradicts the old doctrine of the fall. Corruption, or, as we call it, degeneration, is not merely possible. It is a frequent phenomenon in the course of evolution. Natural selection can do no more than fit a creature to its environment. If the environment is one full of unrealised possibilities, correspondence with it involves the development of new powers and organs—a rising in the scale. But if the new environment is a more restricted one than the old, powers are lost and degeneration results. Yet even in degeneration the forces of evolution continue to operate, and the correspondence with the new and worse environment is gradually perfected. Some of the most marvellous life-histories are those of quite degraded parasites. In the case of man it is therefore simply a question of evidence. If he is, as we believe, a spiritual being intended to respond to spiritual influences and to become a citizen of Heaven, then the determination to live for earthly goods and as a creature of earth is exactly the choice that inevitably brings degeneration. All his progress and civilisation, so far as it is for earthly

ends, to make him more fit for earthly existence, is, indeed, evolution, but in a wrong direction. And biological analogy confirms the doctrine that, the wrong choice once made, its consequences folded themselves about us, so that we are unable, of ourselves, to escape their toils. The only legitimate evolution would have been one, not simply of a purer morality and a truer philosophy of religion, but of spiritual powers admitting us to a more intimate fellowship with God—powers which would also increasingly dominate our bodies and the world about us, and reveal even in the material that latent nature which is a mode of the being of God. When, therefore, in the fullness of time, God visited His people to bring them to Himself, He came to a race that we must call degenerate even in comparison with their initial human condition, in proportion to their progress away from the true path, and most emphatically degenerate in comparison with what by this time they should have become. Quite independently of our interpretation of Genesis, the corruption of our nature is the corollary to the Christian doctrine of man as made to glorify God and fully to enjoy Him.

Now this means also that we must accept the old belief in the wrath of God against sin, and against persistent sinners. We shall understand it not as indignation against infraction of His positive laws, nor as reaction against the insult to His honour, but as antagonism to that which frustrates His

purposes. Seeing that the purpose is the expression of His love for the creation, whose communion with Himself He desires, we may call His wrath a frustrated, disappointed, unanswered love. In subordination to this there is room to acknowledge also the disobedience to law which introduces disorder, and the wound to His honour which is rebellion against His truth. It does not follow that God desires to punish, or that His nature compels Him to punish sin. But it does follow that His love, the infinity of which cannot be quenched by His creatures, will lead Him to restore the disorder in nature, the end of which must otherwise be destruction, since the almighty will of God must prevail. Thus we are led to look for the provision of a Divine means of salvation, the need of which is so abundantly obvious.

The Christian religion proclaims that to be saved a man has to be in Christ. He cannot abide in Christ without the consent of his own will, and hence there must be in him the conversion of a true penitence, as well as the personal adherence of a true faith. For all that, he is in a state of salvation just because he is in Christ. There is no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus. Those who go about to establish their own righteousness inevitably fail. Forgiveness is for those who are accepted in the Beloved, covered by the righteousness of God, washed in His blood of sprinkling. This doctrine of the New Testament is completely in

accordance with the essential nature of forgiveness. As we have seen already, this is a refusal to see the sinner as wholly expressed in his sin. It is an appeal from the evil relation established by sin to some deeper and more real relation for the sake of which forgiveness is granted, though never without cost to him who grants it. The forgiveness of God is based upon no fiction of imputed righteousness, no foreknowledge of future desert, but upon the reality of a present truth. Because we are in Christ, members of His Body, and because Christ is in us, our inseparable life, God admits us to communion with Himself, not reckoning to us our trespasses.

II

This, then, is the result of Christ's work of redemption. We may describe it as the method by which He has made it possible for us to be in Him, and therefore forgiven. Our enquiry into the nature of the Atonement takes, therefore, this form. How did Christ become the Foundation of a new race of mankind, a second Adam? How was He given to be the Head over all things to the Church, which is His Body?

The answer which the Fathers give is as nearly unanimous as we have any right to expect, and it is the natural and necessary answer. Christ became our Head by being made man. Sometimes reference is made to the fact that He is already the

eternal Word by whom all things were made, and on whom, therefore, there rests a certain responsibility for them. But this only extends to the demonstration of the propriety of His headship. He actually became our Head by the Incarnation. Thus Chrysostom says that "the Son of God became Son of man that the sons of men might become sons of God" (in *Joan.*, Hom. XI); which is only a more careful re-statement of Athanasius' "He was made man that we might be made Divine." "Humanity must be sanctified by the humanity of God," is the epigram in which Gregory Nazianzen summarises his frequent references to the doctrine. Gregory of Nyssa expresses it with much simplicity in the words, "Having become what we were He through Himself again united humanity to God" (*Cont. Eun.*, XII). Justin Martyr says, "He became man for our sakes that, becoming a partaker of our sufferings, He might also bring us healing" (2nd Apol., XIII). Irenæus says, "He became what we are that He might bring us to be even what He is himself" (*v.* Preface). The multiplication of such quotations, however, fails to present the truth, which can only be recognised by reading the works of these Fathers themselves—namely, that salvation by means of Christ's union with us through the Incarnation is the very foundation of their view of the Atonement, an idea which governs all their thoughts about it. Treated from the point of view of our regeneration, it is expressed most fully by

Irenæus and Athanasius. The former especially thinks of Christ as recapitulating, or summing up in Himself, our humanity. The latter dwells upon His self-identification with us. Both conceptions are ultimately derived from St. Paul. The one is based upon his statements that Christ has been given as a Head over all things to the Church, that He is the firstborn of all creation, and that in Him are to be summed up all things in Heaven and earth. The other is derived from such texts as "One died for all, therefore all died," "I am crucified with Christ," and "Having been buried with Him in baptism wherein ye were also raised with Him."

But these last quotations show that the doctrine of salvation and forgiveness through the Incarnation has to reckon with the unequivocal teaching of the New Testament that Christ saved us by His death. Calvary and not Bethlehem is the place of reconciliation. The true harmony of the two superficially discordant doctrines has been already displayed. Christ's union with us was only made complete by death. In order to be one with us He had to bear our sins, and in the sin-bearing His death must necessarily be included. For the belief that human death is the externally inflicted punishment of our sin, the execution of sentence imposed upon it by the law given in the Garden of Eden, has disappeared with the belief in the historicity of the first chapters of Genesis. We have to develop the deeper view suggested by St. Paul. According

to him death entered "by means of sin" and not only because of it. It is the wages of sin, a consequence rather than a penalty. Similarly St. James tells us that lust, when it hath conceived, beareth sin, and the sin, when it is full grown, bringeth forth death. We may put it into our own language in this way. The purpose of man's creation was, primarily, that he might unite the material with the spiritual, in order to be the instrument by which the material is itself spiritualised. Every act of sin is a failure to fulfil his mission towards his own body and indirectly towards all creation. Persistence in sin, when it becomes final and complete failure, is spiritual death, but even physical death is failure. The spirit, indeed, lives on, and may make progress, but it has lost its hold upon the flesh and no longer can discharge its first service to its Creator. It has ceased to be that binding link with the material, to be which it was designed. Though, of course, not sinful in the strict sense in which sin is the rebellion of the will, it yet has the nature of sin in being contrary to the will of God. Whether we accept the old scriptural language, according to which the spirit of the very first man should have so dominated his flesh as to have escaped the mortality of his animal ancestry, or whether we believe that by the spiritual evolution which should have started from him, and did not, man would finally have become immortal, matters not to us at present. In either case it is a "might have been," to which

the transfiguration of our Lord perhaps bears witness. But what we do need to see is that the persistence of the rule of death over us is very closely bound up with sin. It is the seal of our degeneration and, as it were, a sacrament of spiritual death. Hence it is that Christ's obedience to death becomes the climax of His sin-bearing. It is the perfecting of His union with us in our fallen state, the final assumption of our infirmity. By His death, therefore, Christ consummated the Atonement.

We cannot be surprised that the Fathers do not teach this doctrine, because it involves a view of the universe which has only become possible in our own time. And therefore they were entangled in an apparent antilogy. Rightly their study of the New Testament led them to proclaim the Incarnation as the means of our redemption. But just as plainly they were bound to confess that the death of Christ was the means. They held the two truths unresolved, but not without attempts at resolution.

The one solution of the problem which they refused was the one that the Western Church has since adopted with evil results. They refused to believe that when Christ took upon Himself our nature and our sins, there was still something more to do, a further demand of the Father which must be satisfied. They did not believe that the Incarnate must be made a scapegoat. As we have seen, the New Testament refuses to accept the scapegoat as a type of Christ. But at least two early

writers do so, and their treatment of it proves how far they were from the modern orthodoxy of the West. The Epistle of Barnabas says that the goat, "accursed and cast out into the wilderness," was a type of Jesus, but only because the Jews, who despised and rejected Him, will meet Him again crowned as King and acknowledge that He was the Son of God. The sufferings of Christ, that is to say, are viewed only as inflicted by men, and not as the bearing of a penalty required by God. Justin Martyr sees in the two goats of the Day of Atonement a composite type of Christ, put to death as man but living as God, and as bearing the sins of the world but not their punishment.

A similar treatment is found in Justin of Christ's being made a curse for us. "He treats the efficacy of the death of Christ as lying, not in a satisfaction to God, but in His identification with the sufferings of the human race on account of sin (its "curses") in order that men may become partakers of His blessings, sharing with Him His victory over death" (Scott Lidgett, p. 427).

There is not, then, merely silence about any satisfaction made to God. The passages of Scripture which most naturally suggest it are dealt with and given a different interpretation. In the face of this we shall not be led to understand in the Western sense a few phrases in Irenæus, in Origen, or in Basil, which are patient of it when isolated from their general teaching. Irenæus, for instance, says that

Christ propitiated for us the Father against whom we had sinned, and cancelled our disobedience by His obedience. But language of this kind is natural in any writer who believes in the objective need of an atonement. The final result is that the Father, who was wroth with us, is so no longer, that we who had need of forgiveness have received it. This is true whether, with the Fathers, we ascribe it to a change in us and in our relation to God through Christ, or, with later writers, to a change in the Father Himself. It is true whether the Father beholds in the work of Christ that restoration and renewal of His creatures which His love demanded, or that expiation which His justice required. We may not infer that language about the reconciliation of the Father to us implies a belief in satisfaction to His justice. But even if it does in some cases, the conception was an aberrant one, not characteristic of even an individual writer. There may be unguarded thought as well as unguarded language.

This is true, for instance, of Athanasius, who is sometimes quoted as a supporter of the satisfaction theory. In him the reason is not haziness of thought, but the absence of the data required to do justice to his material. In fact, he does not know quite what to make of the scriptural teaching about the value of Christ's death. And this just because he sees so clearly the dependence of our salvation upon the Incarnation and Christ's union with us. It has been objected that, when he speaks of death

in relation to sin, he does not make it plain whether he means physical or spiritual death. The physical death of Christ released us from the penalty of death, " for the power of the law was fully spent in the Lord's body and had no longer holding-ground against men, His peers." The parallelism suggests that we were released from physical death, and, indeed, Athanasius labours to show that for Christians death has been so transformed as to be no longer the penalty of sin. It has been " brought into contempt and trodden under foot." At other times, however, the doom upon us seems to be more than physical death. It is a state of progressive ruin manifested in the increasing sinfulness of mankind and resulting finally in utter corruption and nothingness. The ambiguity may be held to be to the credit of Athanasius, inasmuch as it suggests that he saw dimly a connection between physical death and spiritual corruption, although he had no means of defining what it was. He is obliged, therefore, to fall back upon Genesis. Death has been attached to sin, by a positive sentence, as an external penalty. It has become, therefore, a debt which man has incurred, and from which he can only be released by the payment of it. This argument is wholly unsatisfactory to us, because we no longer base our theology upon the *ipsa verba* of Genesis. It must have been also unwelcome to Athanasius, if we may judge by the slightness of his treatment of it and his readiness to turn from it to the more

congenial subject of our regeneration by union with Christ. But it is exactly in this unassimilated portion of his doctrine that he approaches the Western view sufficiently to have been claimed as a supporter of it. Yet even here his silence is more impressive than his speech. He does not definitely say that a satisfaction must be made to God. The debt itself may be thought of rather as a doom that we have incurred than as something owing to God. In any case it is not the divine honour or the divine justice that must be placated. The death must be endured for the vindication of the Divine truth. God has said, "Thou shalt surely die," and "it were monstrous that God, having spoken, should prove false." The necessity of death is not said to depend upon the holiness of God's nature. It is a matter entirely of positive law. In other words, no reason for it can be given, but it must be accepted simply as the revealed will of God. There is no indication that the Western view, of the necessity of a satisfaction, even presented itself to the mind of Athanasius.

III

The patristic attempt to account for the emphasis which the New Testament lays on the death of Christ was actually in a quite different direction. It was based especially on those passages which describe the work of salvation as a redemption, ransom or rescue. Appearing first in Irenæus and

Origen, it reaches full development in Gregory of Nyssa. This is the famous doctrine of the ransom from Satan. Bethune-Baker's summary of the essential points in Gregory's view is as follows—

"Man had delivered himself over to the enemy (the devil) and bartered away his freedom. Justice therefore required that the recovery of his freedom should be effected by a transaction as voluntary on the side of the enemy as the fall had been on the side of man. Such a ransom must be paid as the master of the slave would agree to accept in exchange for the slave. In the Deity invested with flesh he recognised a unique object of desire, the flesh veiling the Deity sufficiently to preclude the fear which the devil would otherwise have felt. He eagerly accepted the proffered exchange and, like a ravenous fish, having gulped down the bait of the flesh, was caught by the hook of the Deity which it covered. . . . The veiling of the Deity in human nature was 'in some measure a fraud and a surprise.' The deception Gregory admits, and justifies" (*Hist. of Christian Doctrine*, p. 341).

The theory, as stated by Gregory in mythological language, seems to us both grotesque and immoral, but before we dismiss with contempt a view that appealed to most great thinkers from St. Irenæus to St. Bernard, we shall do well to enquire what there was of religious value under so strange a form. First, we must recognise that the idea of a ransom from the power of darkness or of Satan is quite scriptural. That the Christian has to war against principalities and powers, against the world-rulers of this darkness, against spiritual hosts of wicked-

ness, is also scriptural. That Christ is Himself our Leader in the war is the subject of one of the grandest pictures of the Apocalypse. We are justified in speaking of Him as the divine Champion of our race, contending with Satan. Then, we must see that even Gregory does not represent Him as making any personal surrender of Himself to Satan, or in any way doing him homage. He simply submits Himself to suffer death at the hands of Satan. It is a voluntary coming under his power, but not an acknowledgment of his power. It is not in any way comparable with the mediæval idea of a man selling himself to the devil, which would, of course, have been intolerable blasphemy. In fact, it may be said that there was no real giving of Himself to Satan, but only a feint of doing so, a stratagem in what was really a war though expressed in terms of barter. We are not at present dealing with the morality of this, but there seems no reason to suppose that Gregory of Nyssa would have dissented from his namesake of Nazianzen, who repudiates any offering of the blood of Christ to Satan. What he affirms is that Christ came under the power of Satan's tyranny, shared our bondage, the evil consequences of our sinful submission, and so delivered us. In this there is a truth of real importance. Himself without sin, Christ assumed the likeness of sinful flesh. He took our nature as it actually is, subject to death, deprived of the proper dominance of spiritual powers, impaired by its long, sinful

history. He accepted all the evil consequences of sin, though not the sin; except in the admitted sense of the sin-bearing. Had He not done so there would have been no real union with us, and therefore no deliverance. How could the Fathers, with their belief in a personal devil, have better expressed this than by saying that Christ for our sakes became subject to Satan, and that this was the ransom which He paid? It saved their view of salvation by Christ's solidarity with us from becoming a merely physical or metaphysical process, a non-moral theosophy. He experienced a conflict with evil, an agonising in the domain of the moral and spiritual. Ultimately the redemption was not only a taking of our nature, but an enduring of the consequences of our sins—a sin bearing, a death. "So it is," says Gregory, "that He who stands upright stoops to one who has fallen in order to lift him up from his prostrate condition."

But what shall we say of the morality of the means by which, according to Gregory, Christ entered into this fellowship with us? At least it was not a dishonest bargain but a stratagem of war. "That by veiling the deity in human nature God, without the knowledge of His enemy, *got within the lines* of him who had man in his power, is in some measure a fraud and a surprise." Gregory's own defence is, roughly, that it served the devil right and paid him in his own coin, but we cannot be content with that. It is really part of his

mythology and not to be taken very seriously. But we may observe that we are not so shocked when the supposed treatment of Satan is accorded to his human instruments. St. Peter said that God delivered Christ into the hands of wicked men whose action, wicked as it was, was made possible by His determinate counsel and foreknowledge. It was certainly true of them that His divinity was unknown to them, and that they believed themselves able to conquer Him by death. St. John (xii. 39, 40) apparently regards their unbelief as a judicially inflicted blindness having its source in God, and certainly in other cases God is said so to have dealt with men. If it be urged that for them there was a place of repentance and that Christ prayed, "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do," the answer is that Gregory and others expected Satan also to be saved at last by Christ. Hence they represented the deception of him as that which a physician practises towards a patient for the patient's good.

After all, the point is a small one seeing that we are not called upon to defend the language in which Gregory's theory is expounded. But it introduces us to a larger one. The supposed deception was needed to account for Satan's willingness to attack Christ, and that willingness was demanded in order to show that God acted justly in redeeming from Satan those who had willingly submitted to him. That God must deal justly even with Satan, and

not simply by an exercise of superior power, was a common thought in the patristic age. What, then, is God's justice? In men justice is manifested towards other men by rendering to all their dues and having respect to their rights. I must so act within my sphere as to leave others equal freedom within theirs. There must be the preservation of the integrity of all personalities, in me and in them. The same manifestation of justice is impossible in God, since it involves the recognition of equals. But there is a kindred one. God's righteousness towards me is a respect for my personality in the sense that He will do no violence to the nature which He has Himself created and to which He has given its laws. He will not coerce my freedom, because He has ordained me to be free. God's righteousness means that He is not arbitrary, capricious or unaccountable. It resolves itself into self-consistency; He cannot deny Himself. But it is the self-consistency of one who has character, who is, in short, Love. Love, we have seen, is the only possible explanation of His creative activity, and again, in creating He is necessarily self-limiting. In the universe governed according to law He exhibits love, as its source; self limitation, as its method; and righteousness, as its uniformity. God is love, and His righteousness is that His love changes not. God creates by self-limitation, and His righteousness is that He never abandons it.

We can see, then, why it would have been un-

righteous in God to have annihilated us for our sins, or to have ignored them, or to have removed them by an act of almighty will. Either course would have involved an abandonment of the method of His eternal purpose for us in Christ Jesus. We can see, also, how this sinful world had rights before God. In itself it had not, any more than the potter's clay. But God's righteousness led Him to have respect to the laws of its creation, which cannot be broken even by Him without failure in His self-consistency. Wherever, then, God has conferred freedom, wherever He has created personal beings, He must respect the freedom, and act, as an early writer said, not by force but by persuasion. The will that sets itself against His will must, indeed, be defeated in the end, but it will not be destroyed or forced. He will not save men, it has been said, against their will. So, if we can place ourselves in the position of the Fathers, who believed that Satan is the prince of this world, we can see that God's righteousness required Him to redeem the world, not by destroying or banishing Satan, but by leaving him free to work his will; and yet by endurance of it utilising his very enmity as the means by which to accomplish His own righteous purposes.

When we get behind the outward grotesqueness of the patristic doctrine, we find that it was perhaps the most majestic and the most moving of all doctrines of atonement. What did God do because

of man's sin? In a very true sense He did nothing. He continued to carry out the purpose with which He had made the worlds. He had purposed to bring them into union with Himself, and because of His righteousness He did not change His plan. When the fulness of time came God sent forth His Son. Yet it is not as though the surges of disobedience broke in vain upon a Rock that was insensible of them. The patience and the power of God are the patience and the power of love that never faileth. The Son of God took to Himself the race of men—took us with our sin. He took us in the righteousness of love though it meant for Him, "Behold and see if there be any sorrow like unto My sorrow." It was not the iron imperturbability of a rock of Fate but the perfect voluntary self-sacrifice of unconquerable, all-conquering Love.

IV

Upon such a doctrine as we have been describing there has been grafted what we have frequently referred to as the Western or Latin theory. Throughout its modifications there is the conception of God as the moral Governor of the world and the Judge of men. He may act with the autocratic selfishness of a feudal lord, or with the cold impersonality of a modern court of law, or with the tenderness of a father, but He is always the Judge. Such a conception was congenial to the imperial mind of Rome.

Her general bias was intensified, as has been often said, by the fact that many of the great Latin theologians were trained for the legal profession and had practised in the courts. Such were Tertullian, Cyprian, Minucius Felix, Ambrose, and Gregory, while even Augustine in his earlier days breathed the same atmosphere, and at a later time owed much to Ambrose. As early as Cyprian the penitential system of the West was based upon the idea of a satisfaction to be made to God. "The Latins were familiar with the notion that the Christian had to propitiate God, that cries of pain, sufferings and deprivations were means, sacrificial means, of expiation, that God took strict account of the quantity of the atonement, and that, where there was no guilt to be blotted out, those very means were represented as merits" (Harnack, *D. G.*, Eng. trans., iii., p. 311). In this teaching we have already the germ of the mediæval doctrine of merits, which had such evil fruit in the system of indulgences. But our interest is in its application to the work of Christ. Man was not able to save himself by good works, though these were required by God, and therefore what he should have done for himself, and could not, Christ did for him. Thus Christ's sufferings were a substitute for man's, and a source of vicarious merit.

The Latin Fathers did not, it is true, work out a theory of salvation on these lines. On the contrary, they professed to hold the same view as the

Greeks, and spoke of God rescuing man by justice, not by force, of the deception of Satan, of Christ's humanity as the bait by which he was caught. But they give greater prominence to the thought of His dealing with the Father on man's behalf. The penetration of Augustine already perceived the fundamental irrationality of the nascent theory—

"How are we reconciled by the death of the Son of God? Not, surely, because the Father, though angry with us, saw that death and was appeased? Then the Son would have been already so fully appeased that He died for us; but the Father was still so wroth that He would not have been appeased unless His Son had died. And yet the Father so loved us that He spared not His own Son."

We can only make Augustine's teaching self-consistent, as Scott Lidgett says, "by understanding the sacrifice to be the self-surrender of our Lord to the will of the Father that He should deal with the devil by submitting Himself to death." In fact, we must credit Augustine with being loyal to the primitive and Catholic view. But we cannot be sure of the self-consistency of Augustine or, in this respect, of any Latin writer of his age. They were in a period of transition, and the new thoughts did not harmonise with the old. One very prevalent idea betrays the coming error. It is that Christ must offer the Sacrifice as man, and not as the Eternal Son and Word. On this point Harnack is again helpful.

" The subtle distinction between East and West is accordingly to be defined as follows : Both held that the human nature of Christ suffered, for the divine was incapable of suffering; but the East taught that the Deity suffered through the human nature which He had made His own, the West that the man suffered and presented His human nature as a sacrifice in death ; the latter, however, obtained an infinite value, for the Deity was associated with it " (*D. G.*, Eng. trans., p. 314).

Man, according to the Latins, had to atone for his sins. Actually the one Man Jesus Christ died for all. But He was able to do it because He was the representative Man, or else one Man accepted for all. In Him we see Man offering to God in gift of such value that the mind of God is changed towards us and placated. Exactly what the nature of the gift is may be matter of controversy, and in fact upon this the various types of the doctrine depend. But, in any case, that is the sacrifice which redeems us. Using the word in this sense, and excluding the meaning attributed above to Augustine, Harnack says—

" On the whole, therefore, the conception of sacrifice is really alien in the view of the Greeks to the strict theory of Christ's significance. It found its way in through exegesis and the mysteries, and threatened the compactness of the dogmatic conception, according to which everything that Christ did was summed up in the *complete assumptio carnis*. Nor was the alien view able to shake the fundamental conception that the God-Logos was the *subject* in all that pertained to Christ. Among the

Latins, on the other hand, the idea of the atoning sacrifice *plus* substitution is genuine, and has no general theory against it; for they never were able to rise perfectly to the contemplation of Christ's work as the *assumptio carnis*, an expression of the loftiest piety among the Greeks" (*D. G.*, Eng. trans., iii., p. 314).

The sources of the Latin theory are thus seen to be the legalism of the Roman view of man's relation to God, and a somewhat stupid inability to appreciate the results of the Incarnation. From such beginnings not much of value was to be expected. What has followed is a long-continued and unsuccessful attempt to give a rational and religious account of the theory. With its details we have no occasion to burden ourselves, but some of its principles and results are of interest.

Anselm lays down that there are three possible ways in which God may deal with sin. He may punish it, or accept satisfaction for it, or freely forgive it. The last alternative is that of the patristic theory. For according to it man's part was simply to appropriate the redemption provided in Christ, and Christ had won redemption for us not as human, though in and by means of His human nature, but as the eternal Son of God. Of the others Calvinism adopts the first. Man in Christ bore the punishment of his sins. Anselm himself teaches that Christ made satisfaction for us, by the suffering of a death which was not due from Him, and which, therefore, on the Latin view, possessed

merit. The theory which, first proclaimed by McLeod Campbell, is better known in Moberley's improved form, is also a theory of satisfaction. But in this Christ makes reparation by an act of corporate or representative penitence.

It is to be remembered that these theories are in no way complementary. They are alternative, and to hold one implies that one rejects the others. Thus the basis of Anselm's view is that Christ's death was not due from Him. Its satisfactory power lies in its being a work of supererogation. But according to Calvin the covenant between the Father and the Son includes the acceptance of Christ instead of sinners, bearing the whole guilt of their sins and therefore justly punished by death. McLeod Campbell, again, quotes from the representative Calvinist President, Edwards, that God must exact for sin "either an equivalent punishment or an equivalent sorrow and repentance," and while Edwards asserts the former alternative his own theory advocates the latter. There has been, then, a very grave theological difficulty for those who hold that Christ had to deal with the Father in respect of sin. They have differed essentially in their description of the nature of the dealing. They cannot really discover that any such dealing was in fact necessary, and when one proclaims that he has succeeded, he fails to obtain support from the whole body of theologians. His view prevails, it may be, for a time but sooner or later its unsoundness is recognised.

This is bound to be exemplified in the case of McLeod Campbell, although at present his statement has been made popular in Anglican circles, where Calvinism has always been suspected, and is now almost universally disavowed. Valuable as Dr. Moberley's work is, especially in its insistence on the need of the Holy Spirit's present activity for the perfecting of the work of Christ in us, he fails to make good his doctrine of the atonement itself. His treatment of penitence may even be condemned as word-juggling. Penitence is that change of a person's mind and will by which the sinner who had identified himself with sin becomes really and personally identified with holiness. The turning point is marked by genuine confession of sin. Moberly claims that penitence has in itself an atoning value, but his examples show that the value lies in the resultant identification with holiness. What he finds, however, in Christ's death is a perfect and flawless confession of human sin, and he has not shown, and cannot show, that any atoning value belongs to that. In fact, his treatment leads more rationally to the view of Dr. Forsyth, which finds the difficulty of free forgiveness in the holiness of God, and the removal of it in the offering of a human holiness by Christ—first His own personal holiness, and prospectively the holiness which He is to create in us. Any theory which makes the offering of Christ a representative one must, however, incur a second objection, to which both Dr.

Moberly and Dr. Forsyth are open. It may sufficiently account for the Cross as the inauguration of a new human relation to God, but it does not account for its aspect of finality. Dr. Forsyth recognises the existence of this. "We are spiritually in a reconciled world, we are not merely in a world in process of empirical reconciliation." But if Christ's death was simply a corporate prefigurement of what He will progressively accomplish in us, or even a representative act giving validity to our individual penitence or holiness, the whole stress must be laid upon the actual accomplishment of what was first done representatively. We really are in a world in process of empirical reconciliation. And a still further objection is that to become our representative Christ must already have identified Himself with humanity. Until He has done that He can neither offer any penitence nor a human holiness. And when God has so completely taken the manhood into God that His action is man's action, has not the atonement been made already, in any sense in which it can be said to have been made by Christ in His own Person? For such reasons as these, we believe that the Campbell and Moberly theory, as well as that of Dr. Forsyth, will in the end be found as unsatisfactory as those for which they are substituted. The Latin assumption has not yet been proved capable of a rational theological statement.

It is to be observed, in the next place, that each

of the three main attempts has given rise to modifying statements, or re-statements, necessitated by their inherent weakness and incompatibility with facts of revelation or of experience. This phenomenon has also been of frequent occurrence in the history of science, where it has uniformly been recognised at last as an attempt to bolster up an untenable hypothesis. It was well illustrated, for instance, in the later stages of Ptolemaic astronomy. The history of the Latin assumption has been similar. Anselm was followed by St. Thomas Aquinas, who surrendered the necessity of the atonement, and admitted that, as the offence was solely against God Himself, there was no reason in the nature of God why He should not freely forgive it. He chose the method of providing a satisfaction for our sakes, because of the lessons and motives which it afforded to lead us to righteousness and the love of God. Calvin, similarly, was followed by Grotius, for whom the sufferings of Christ were simply in order that the good government of the world might be promoted by an exhibition to men of God's hatred of sin as well as His love and desire to pardon sinners. Perhaps we may say that Moberly has been followed by Forsyth, who says, "To conclude, then, God could only justify man before Him by justifying Himself and His holy law before men. . . . Even the sinner could not trust a love that could not justify itself as holy." The need of the Cross here also is that God's holiness may be vindicated before

men. It is as educational as in Aquinas and Grotius. This is really half-way to subjectivism, and it introduces the dilemma of all subjectivism. For Christ's death is not educational, it does not illustrate the holiness of God, and it does not witness to His love, unless it was already necessary, as a self-sacrifice of God.

From another point of view the modifications of theory which have been made from time to time are interesting for the persistence with which they tend in the direction of the patristic doctrine. Thus we may view even these which have just been mentioned as leading back to a fuller sense of love as the divine impulse in redemption. When a semi-Calvinist justifies the vicariousness of Christ's death by pointing out that the Judge who imposes the penalty is Himself the Victim who endures it, he is getting back to the Atonement as divine rather than human action. When attention is drawn to our union with Christ as the means by which we become partakers of the benefit of the Cross, and still more when the sufferings of Christ are seen to be the consequence of His self-identification with us, and not as a merely external penalty, we are a long way towards seeing in that self-identification the very accomplishment of Atonement. Dr. Forsyth can even begin his exposition by saying that, " When Christ did what He did, it was not human nature doing it, it was God doing it. It was not human nature offering its very best to God, it was God

offering His very best to man. The Sacrifice of the Cross was not man in Christ pleasing God; it was God in Christ reconciling man, and in a certain sense reconciling Himself." If Dr. Forsyth had consistently adhered to this attitude he would have taught the ancient Catholic doctrine, but the influence of the Latin assumption was too strong for him, and so he can write, " What Christ presented to God for His complete joy and satisfaction was a perfect racial obedience," as if it were, after all, " man in Christ pleasing God."

It is, perhaps, the strongest of all indictments against the Western doctrine of a meritorious self-sacrifice, placating or satisfying God by its intrinsic value, that so many great scholars have found in it a doctrine of despair. Bishop Butler and Dean Church are among them. Scott Lidgett mentions among living writers Mr. A. J. Balfour and Dr. Horton. One meets them in the standard text-books of our colleges—such as Gibson on the Articles and Sanday and Headlam on the Romans. These men accept the Atonement as a fact, but as one which we cannot hope to understand. A doctrine of the Atonement is impossible. Propitiation, as Sanday and Headlam put it, is a word which we must leave to the Holy Spirit to interpret. " We drop our plummet into the depth, but the line attached to it is too short, and it does not touch the bottom. The awful processes of the Divine mind we cannot fathom. Sufficient for us to know that through the virtue of the

One Sacrifice our sacrifices are accepted, that the barrier which sin places between us and God is removed, and that there is a "sprinkling" which makes us free to approach the throne of grace." Now, in a sense we may accept this statement, except the ambiguous word "virtue"; in that sense, namely, in which it is true of all our knowledge. We never get "to the bottom" of anything. But we decline to accept it in a special sense of the Atonement, and to the extent of disclaiming any power to understand what is written in the Bible, for our learning, about the foundation fact of Christianity. We feel sure that the Apostles understood what they wrote and expected their readers to understand. But in those days the minds of men had not been clouded by the Latin assumption.

Moreover, the agnostic position is too unstable and too irrational to make converts. Men who are told to accept the fact of the Atonement on authority, as a fact of revelation, or even of other men's experience, without any hope of understanding it, will generally refuse to do so. As a matter of fact, they do refuse. They either throw over Christianity altogether, or they profess a half-hearted allegiance which virtually means a trust in the love of God, and an admiration of the character and the moral teaching of Christ. They perhaps retain a hope that it is all true, but it has no vital power in their lives. Their real guide in this life is the corporate holiness of Christianity, and their real hope of a

life to come is the conviction of the supremacy of love. But the deeper springs of religion are dried up in them. A true and reasonable doctrine of the Atonement is necessary if the world is to be reconverted.

Surely the true doctrine is the old one. One might even claim that no other had ever received Catholic consent, the consent of the whole body of the Church. For those who hold some form of the Latin theory depend little upon it for their religious support. Toplady was an ardent Calvinist, but there is no Calvinism in " Rock of Ages." There Christ is not the vicarious victim for us, but the fountain of cleansing, and our hope depends on union with Him. The doctrine of " Jesu, lover of my soul " is identical. Toplady was at daggers drawn with the Wesleys on the theory of the Atonement, but he and Charles Wesley could have sung each other's hymns. It might astonish us, if we could examine closely the language of any orthodox hymnal, to find how few of them speak of Christ's obtaining mercy from the Father, or offering Himself to deal with our sins before the Father, or (to quote an exception) letting " His merits stand for ours." They dwell instead upon His love in condescending to us, upon His sin-bearing, upon His cleansing of our souls. The heart of the Church keeps true to the primitive conception of the Atonement. It is only her intellect that has been led astray.

Not that our doctrinal aberration has been without

effect upon our spiritual life. We have been taught to dwell upon the love of Christ, but the love of the Father has been obscured. Hence our warmest love and our most fervent thanksgivings have been reserved for Christ. The cult of the Sacred Heart of Jesus, and the prevalent " Jesus worship " expressed in our private manuals and popular hymns are examples. Except a few psalm-paraphrases there is scarcely a hymn in our collections addressed to the Father which can be placed in the first rank of favourites. Even the old associations of " Glory to Thee " have yielded to " Sun of my soul " and " Abide with me." It can hardly be claimed that this is a healthy state of religious emotion, or a true preservation of the spirit of the *Gloria in excelsis* or the *Te Deum*. For in them we find indeed the indispensable adoration of the Incarnate Son, but it is in proper relation to the equally important worship of the Father and of the Holy Ghost.

We are not, then, except to the extent just noticed, seeking to impose a new theory of atonement on the Church or even to recall her to one that she has discarded. We are asking her to abandon a theological position which Anselm received from the dark ages preceding him and handed on to be the burden of centuries. But it is only the theologians who have gone astray. We ask them to return to no past age, but to the present conviction and experience of all converted souls. We ask them to base their systematic doctrinal exposi-

tions upon the facts of spiritual life. Let us understand what St. Paul meant when he said "God—that is the Father—commendeth His love, His own love, to us in that while we were yet sinners Christ died for us." For the death of Christ was the self-sacrifice of God. It was the violence done to Himself in taking us and our sins into union with Himself. There was no need for man to make reparation for his sin, nor was there any power. On our part we have nothing to plead. On our side the Cross means what we have inflicted on God. On His side it means infinite and inexpressible love. Henceforth in God-made-man there is a perfect reconciliation and atonement, a perpetual propitiation or fount of cleansing, a sprinkling of blood upon us, which is the power to become one with Him, and because we are in Him to be seen of God in Him, and receive forgiveness of our sins and eternal life.

LECTURE V

WORSHIP IN CHRIST

"In whom we have boldness, and access in confidence through our faith in Him."—Eph. iii. 12.

MAN, we found in our first lecture, was created to be a worshipper of God. Through sin he lost to a great extent the power, and forfeited the right, to offer an acceptable worship. But God has in Christ provided an atonement for sin, and man reconciled in Christ becomes a worshipper again on a far higher level than before. Not only has he a new theme for his praise because of his redemption, but he has himself become a new creature. He is in Christ, and worships in Christ, with Christ as the High Priest of his offerings. Henceforth Christ is with His own on earth and they are with Him in heavenly places.

I

The instinct of the Church has led her to proclaim as the chief fact about her Master at the present time, that He sitteth at the right hand of the Father. To this witness is borne by St. Paul, by St. Peter, by St. John, and by the authors of Hebrews and the

appendix to St. Mark. But their statements all depend upon the 110th Psalm, which Christ also quoted concerning Himself. "The Lord said unto my Lord, sit Thou on My right hand until I make Thy enemies the footstool of Thy feet." To this verse must be added the later one which says, "Thou art a priest for ever after the order of Melchizedek." The picture presented to us is, first, one of accomplished victory and triumph; secondly, of Christ's exaltation and union with the Father, with whom He reigns, equal to Him in all things save for that priority of order which gives to the Father the central throne; and thirdly, of His royal high Priesthood.

The two offices of Kingship and Priesthood here assigned to Christ are so far from being contradictory that they are really two aspects of the same office and dignity. We need not refer to the opinion of some anthropologists that they had a common origin. What is important is that they draw together at their highest. Kings and priests are always leaders of their people, and in their perfect development representatives of them, not separated by superior blood or privileged caste, not ruling by external authority, but bearing their people in their hearts. They have, in each case, an inclusive personality, and the difference between them is simply in the direction of their activities. The king, and the people in their king, face the world where there are battles to fight—countries to be

subdued, domains to be replenished and developed. The priest, and the people in the priest, face God and offer to Him sacrifice, worship and intercession. Thus the ascended Christ is King in His government of the world, and in that activity His people are united with Him. "As My Father hath sent Me, even so send I you." "All authority is given to Me in Heaven and in earth. Go ye therefore and make disciples of all nations." When He goes forth to judge and make war in righteousness, the armies of Heaven follow Him. All that the Church does in His name, to establish His authority and proclaim His will, is His own work by her. When she baptises, the Lord adds souls to the company of the saved. When her children are sentenced to prison and to death, He complains, "Why persecutest thou Me?" When an Apostle thinks of his missionary labours, they are "the things that Christ hath wrought by me." Hence the Church is His mystical Body, not only because she is filled in every part with His life. She is, what our bodies are to us, the means by which He reveals His presence and gives expression to His will and accomplishes His work.

The High Priesthood of Christ is, in the first place, quite similarly exercised, and in similar union with His people. He is, in the language of Clement of Rome, the High Priest of our offerings. We worship the Father through Him, in Whom only we have our access. Having Him as a great priest

over the house of God, we draw near with boldness unto the throne of grace.

"Do you think," says Origen, "that my Lord, the true High Priest, will deign to receive from me any part of the incense compounded of grains, which He bears with Him to the Father? Do you think that He will find in me any little spark of fire, and my burnt offering glowing, that He may deign of it to fill His censor with coals, and on them to offer to God the Father an odour of sweetness? Blessed is he the coals of whose burnt offering He shall find so living and so glowing that He may consider them fit to place upon the altar of incense. . . . But on the other hand, miserable is that soul whose fire of faith is extinguished, whose ardour of charity is growing cold, to whom when our celestial High Priest comes, He finds in it dead cinders and cold ashes" (in *Levit.* Hom. IX).

By such passages meaning is given to that established teaching of the Church which speaks of Christ as the true Priest of every Eucharist. "He it is Who offers and is offered."

But besides this union of Christ with us in our worship, He Himself approaches the Father in our behalf. This is the Intercession which occupies a place of some prominence in St. Paul and is one of the great themes of Hebrews. In thinking of it we must guard against avoidable anthropomorphism, against too literal transference of earthly things to Heaven. Christ does not present Himself before the Father as a suppliant. To suppose that would be to ignore His perfect communion with the Father

and His session on the Father's Throne. The petition that He makes is already in the mind of the Father. The will that He expresses is already the Father's will. "I say not that I will pray the Father for you, for the Father Himself loveth you." Nor again are we to think of the communion between the Father and the Son as a stream of separate and successive acts of thought and will. Christ pleads for us by what He is. "His glorified humanity is the eternal pledge of the absolute efficacy of His accomplished work. He pleads, as older writers truly expressed the thought, by His presence on the Father's throne" (Westcott, *Hebrews*, p. 230). The basis of intercession is this His union with mankind. His manhood, made perfect, is what our manhood is being made, or at least ought to be becoming. The ills that we endure need the sanctifying grace that will make them helpful for our perfection. Christ's manhood would not be an intercession for me if it were seen in contrast to mine. If His presence in Heaven, and my absence—my inability and unfitness to be present—are contrasted, His victory only emphasises my defeat and His Holiness my sin. His manhood is my plea, because I am seen in Him. "Only look on us as found in Him," is our prayer, and on that same inclusiveness is based His intercession, which pleads, so to speak, "Only look on them as found in Me."

It might seem that this view of the Intercession, which Westcott rightly claims to be the Catholic

one, deprives us of its justly treasured particularity. But the fear is a groundless one. Though not cast into the form of particular petitions, it includes every personal and special need. How it does so we may explain by a reference to that well-known saying of Christ, " Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto Me." The good deed to the brethren can only be done to Christ because He has already taken the brethren's needs as His own. If when we feed the hungry we feed Christ, then the hunger of the hungry must already have been His. Hence we infer that all the ills which assail us are, as they arrive, taken up into Him and adopted as His own. They are presented before the Father, each one in all its particular circumstances, because, as they emerge, they are accepted by Christ as facts of His own experience. " He sympathises with our grief " is an adequate statement only when we give to the word " sympathise " its full etymological meaning. He also feels it—the grief which was ours, but has become ours in Him and His in us.

It is not inconsistent with this view that the intercession should be made for those who are not yet members of His Body. He is the Head of our whole race, and suffered to take away the sins of the world. The ignorance of the heathen has thus a place in His intercession, because, though not in Him, they are of Him, His by right of His inclusive manhood. He owns to a divine necessity upon

Himself to make them wholly His, but already He claims them as His sheep. "Other sheep I have which are not of this fold. Them also I must bring." Such an attitude ensures that they are already, as it were negatively, reckoned in Himself; and therefore their need, which is His, is presented by Him before the Father. In the same way we understand His relation to the sins which defile even His own members. Our sin is in Him as a contradiction demanding removal. That it exists in spite of His Redemption of His world, is itself a plea that by the grace of the Holy Spirit it may be conquered and cease to be. In this relation Christ's intercession is called advocacy, and the ground of His advocacy, St. John tells us, is His righteousness. "We have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ, the righteous." For the whole Body of Christ should be righteous as He is righteous, and its unrighteousness must be done away, in order to the accomplishment of all that is signified by its being His Body. Thus the inclusiveness of Christ's glorified Humanity pleads for the sanctification of every member of it. As His self-identification with us won our forgiveness, so His propitiation, the continual application of His cleansing Blood, ever renews in the souls to which He applies it, their forgiveness and incorporation in Him.

It is sometimes said that when we plead Christ's sacrifice as the warrant for our prayers for grace and forgiveness, we are doing on earth what He is doing

in Heaven. A very little consideration will show that the supposed parallelism does not exist. Union with Him is exemplified in this direction when we ourselves engage in priestly intercession for the world. Our prayers are indeed then presented in union with the continuous Intercession of our High Priest. But when we plead Christ's Death, as all Christians must in some way do, we are rather emphasising our personal distinctness from Christ. In so far as we have become truly united with Him there is no need for it. But because our union is imperfect, and we neither are nor do on earth all that He is and does in Heaven, we have need to seek a renewal of forgiveness and an increase of His abiding in us. It is for this reason that the pleading of Christ's sacrifice was in the great liturgies always made before the consecration. After that point, when we are to worship only as one with Christ, the appropriate form is, for us as for Him, priestly intercession.

II

It becomes necessary at this point to say clearly that we have no authority whatever for speaking of Christ in Heaven as pleading His death or offering Himself in sacrifice for us. It is true that His self-oblation is eternal, and that now, as much as on the Cross, He devotes Himself to fulfilling the will of the Father. It is true that this involves a present

mediatorial work in us, the cleansing of us from sin and the transforming of us into His own likeness. But the sense in which men use the language to which we take exception is quite different. They mean that Christ presents Himself as a sacrificial Victim before the Father, to win from Him benefits for us, through His own merits and for His sake. We must show that this is not true, because it is our enemy, the Latin assumption, in a new form. We have contended that this is not the true significance even of the Cross. Still less can it be true of Christ's activity in Heaven.

The advocates of the theory base their teaching upon four passages of the New Testament, of which two can be dismissed quite briefly.

1. He is the propitiation for our sins (1 St. John ii. 2.)

The present tense is emphasised, and we can accept the emphasis. But the propitiation, as we have seen, is not to be thought of as a gift-sacrifice before God. It is, as always, the sprinkling of the blood upon the defiled. The scene of it is therefore on earth and not in Heaven, and it has no bearing upon our present enquiry.

2. Every High Priest is appointed to offer both gifts and sacrifices : wherefore it is necessary that this one also have somewhat to offer (Heb. viii. 3).

This is supposed to mean that as long as He is a Priest, that is, for ever, He must have a sacrifice to offer. In this case the present tense " is neces-

sary " is not expressed in the Greek. But on that point no argument is needed. The real meaning is clear from the context. In the preceding chapters the personal qualifications of our High Priest have been set forth. In those which follow the subject is His sacrifice on Calvary and the New Covenant in His Blood. The verse before us indicates the change of subject. " Now to sum up what we are saying," the chapter began, " we have such a high priest " as has been described. Like all priests He is a minister of a sanctuary—the true heavenly one. For every priest offers sacrifice. Therefore this One must do so. By this transition the author enters upon his new subject, the sacrifice of Christ. If it is offered in Heaven he will no doubt presently say so, but not in this verse, which only announces the subject.

3. The vision of the Lamb in Heaven (Rev. v.)

St. John pictures Christ as a Lamb sacrificed yet living, and it is asserted that He is represented as offering Himself to God. But He is not. He comes on the scene as the opener of the sealed book in the Father's hand, and the book reveals the principles of the Divine government of the world, whether the visions which follow are taken to be the prediction of historical events, or the unfolding of a true philosophy of history. It has more to do with Christ's Kingship than with His Priesthood. The figure of the Lamb is certainly sacrificial. He is the King Who reigns by self-sacrifice. His

strength is the weakness of God which is stronger than men. He is Christ crucified, the power of God and the wisdom of God, as the horns and the eyes teach us. The continuity between the passion and the exaltation of Christ is thus expressed. Jesus Christ is the same yesterday and to-day and for ever. He rules in Heaven and earth by the consecration of the Cross. But what has any of this to do with a heavenly sacrifice offered to God? In the vision He makes no offering of Himself by word or action. Nor do the surrounding hosts plead His death. Their songs are all of praise for the redemption once made, not of prayer that it may be universally fruitful. But it is said that Christ stands before the throne, in the attitude of a priest. St. John does not say so. On the contrary, he says that He stands "in the midst of the throne and of the four living creatures, and in the midst of the elders." Incidentally we must picture Him before the Father in order that He may receive the book. But His attitude cannot be called priestly, because He assumes it in order to perform a kingly action. A simple illustration may appeal to our opponents. The priest who takes the eastward position at the altar is accused of turning his back upon the congregation. In a stupidly literal sense he does so. But to describe his position in such terms is to do him a grave injustice. His attitude has not that significance. Similarly if St. John had intended us to attach significance to the Lamb's standing before

the throne he must have described that as His position. Actually he describes Him as having a different relation to the throne and the heavenly hosts. He is in the midst. That Christ is abidingly the Lamb Who was once sacrificed is admitted by every one, but there is absolutely nothing in the scene which justifies the inference that His sacrifice is being offered in Heaven.

4. The symbolism of the day of atonement (Heb. ix.)

The Jewish High Priest on the day of atonement entered the holy of holies with the blood of the sacrifice which he sprinkled on and before the mercy-seat. That entrance is treated in Hebrews as typical of the Ascension of Christ into Heaven, and therefore if Christ presents the merits of His death and pleads it before God, the sprinkling of the blood is obviously typical of His heavenly self-oblation. This is indeed asserted by Western theologians, but it is not to be found in the Epistle. On the contrary, there is a marked refusal to make the comparison. In verse 12 Christ is said to have entered "through" and not "with" His own blood. It was not carried in to be offered, but it was already shed in order to qualify Him for entrance in the capacity of our High Priest. The mention of the blood causes a digression which extends to verse 23, in which the day of atonement disappears from our view, and Christ's blood-sprinkling is compared with the rite of the red heifer, and the sprinkling

of the people at the making of the covenant, and of the tabernacle and its furniture at their dedication. In all these cases the blood was used for the cleansing of the defiled, and the conclusion is that the heavenly things themselves must be cleansed by the better sacrifice of Christ. His blood is cleansing blood, not an expiatory gift to the Father. When in verse 24 we return to the rites of the day of atonement, Christ is simply said to appear before the face of God for us, but He is not said to offer Himself there or plead His death. Repeated offering is denied, but not in the interest of one continuous offering, of which no hint is given. On the contrary, His manifestation once for all to put away sin by His self-sacrifice is definitely connected with His death. "As it is appointed unto men once to die, so Christ also was once offered to bear the sins of many." The passage, then, gives no support to the theory of the heavenly sacrifice. But the result is more than negative. For the imagery so clearly lends itself to the illustration of such a sacrifice that the refusal to use it is virtually a denial that the sacrifice exists.

We have, then, no authority for representing the work of atonement as other than a finished work. Mankind has been reconciled to God. What remains is, in Heaven, Christ's presentation of our worship, and His intercession for us as the actual or potential members of His body, seen only in Him; and on earth, His Kingly rule and guidance, and the

continual propitiation of His blood sprinkled upon our hearts and consciences, that is, the ever-renewed forgiveness of sin and the progressive perfecting of our union with Him. It is in this way that we recognise the presence of the two aspects in His redemption, finality and progressiveness.

III

These two aspects reappear when the redemption is contemplated from our side. The Christian is, on the one hand, a new creature. His nature has been, by one great act of Christ, raised to a higher level, so that he has a new standing before God. Already we sit in heavenly places in Christ. By one offering He has perfected for ever them that are sanctified. But on the other hand, we still groan within ourselves, waiting for the adoption, the redemption of our body. We have the treasure in earthen vessels. Apostles are in travail of us until Christ be formed in us. Our transformation by the indwelling Christ is an experience that will continue until the day of His appearing.

As it is with the individual Christian, so is it with the Church. She is the Body of Christ, vitally united with Him, living with the life of the heavenly Vine, animated by His Holy Spirit, who dwells in her as in a holy temple. She is the pillar and ground of the truth, having an unction from the Holy One, and knowing all things. She is the representative,

and more than the vicar, of Christ on earth, clothed with His authority and power. She is the heavenly Jerusalem adorned as a Bride for her Husband. And yet she is—what history shows her to be. How thoroughly human she is—how touchingly human in her weakness, how terribly human in her sin! For sureness of truth, there is controversy. For godly sincerity, there is intrigue. For divine power, there is failure and defeat. Yet we must hold that as the work of Christ is one, in its finality and in its progressiveness; and as the individual Christian is one, in his ideal perfection and his actual imperfection; so the Church is One in her mysterious spirituality as a Divine society, and in her baffling worldliness as a human society. We shall express it best by saying that she is necessarily sacramental, and it is the nature of a sacrament to be imperfect—to exhibit its inward and spiritual grace only partially by means of its outward and visible form.

We cannot be surprised that sometimes her sons have lost faith in her true unity and have drawn a distinction between the visible Church and a supposed invisible Church, to which could be granted all the wonderful privileges asserted in the New Testament. Yet however excusable the error may be, it overlooks the prime fact of Church history. After all, it is the visible Church that has kept alive the faith of Christ, has enlarged the borders of His Kingdom, has nourished the spiritual life of millions,

and that still labours and witnesses and suffers and worships in His name. The invisible Church which men have invented has none of the characteristics of a body. It does not manifest, for it is invisible; it does not labour, for it has no organisation; it is wholly ineffective, except in so far as it becomes identified with some part, if not with the whole, of the Church visible. The latter may be unworthy to be called the Body of Christ. To the other the name has no conceivable applicability. But indeed the whole controversy is based upon a superficial handling of the difficulty. It treats it as a mere question of boundaries, as if it consisted in determining who is, and who is not, of the Body of Christ. But in reality that is a small part of it. The problem reproduces itself in the case of each individual. Of whomsoever we assert the indwelling of Christ, of him must we also confess an imperfect, sin-tainted, earthly life. If the body must be sinless where shall we find any members for it? It is the mysterious union of the spiritual and the carnal that makes the problem—the redeemed soul in the unredeemed body, the resurrection life enshrined in a corruptible husk. The earthly-heavenly nature of the Church is, after all, only the summation of the same mystery repeated in every one of her members. As Christ wore the Body of His humiliation compassed about with the infirmities of our flesh, so does He unite to Himself this mystical body, with a condescension of love in which men are

slow to believe, although it is not only infirm, but defiled by sin. Still this Man receiveth sinners and accepts their service, or what hope of serving Him could any of us entertain?

IV

The service with which we are at present concerned is the worship which we have to offer. Man, we found, was made to worship, and Christian men worship in Christ. We have therefore to consider what its principles should be, and a preliminary thought is that we are bound in some sort to idealise the worshipping Church. Our sinfulness must also be acknowledged, especially by a humble confession of our unworthiness to take the name of God upon our lips. But when we have so done we claim, not as a right but as a free gift of divine love, that we have access to the Father in the Holy Spirit by the merits and power of our High Priest. We come in the faith of our regeneration, knowing ourselves redeemed and united with our Redeemer.

In the determination of her forms of worship the Church of the Apostolic age was guided, first, by whatever explicit direction Christ had given, and, secondly, by whatever in already existing habits of worship could be carried over from the Jewish religion.

Christ, however, had only laid down general principles. He had ordained the two great sacra-

ments of the Gospel. He had sanctioned united prayer and had promised His presence where two or three were gathered together in His name. He had commanded the use of the Lord's Prayer. That was all, and there was good reason for His reticence. It is the essence of worship that it should be man's response to the love of God, and so the outcome of his own thought and emotion. To impose it by a command, and still more to regulate its details, would have robbed it of the spontaneity which gives it much of its value. Here, if anywhere, human freedom must be respected.

The Christian Church seems also to have found little of assistance in the forms of synagogue worship. Essentially these consisted of the reading of the law and the prophets, with preaching based upon them. To these, prayers and thanksgivings, partly liturgical and partly free, were added. The Christian Church also had its services of instruction. Their character was modified at times by the exercise of the gifts of prophecy and of tongues. But apart from these they could not but consist of the same elements as the synagogue service. Direct imitation seems, however, to be absent. The only form which has survived from early days is the *missa catechumenorum*, which we commonly call the ante-communion. It consisted mainly of readings from the Old and New Testaments, the two series of lections being separated by the singing of a psalm. After these there were exhortations, and finally

intercessory prayers. In later times the prayers formed two series, of which the first was connected with the dismissal of penitents and catechumens, and the second is called the "prayers of the faithful," because they were offered by those who were remaining to take part in the Eucharist which ensued. In actual use the whole must have been one great act of prayer. For its form was the same throughout, the same deacon was the leader of it all, and occupied the same position at the ambon, and its course was uninterrupted by any other act of religion. The liturgiologists have obscured this, by utilising the merely external fact that the catechumens had been excluded, to unite the prayers of the faithful with the Eucharist, instead of with the preliminary service of instruction.

Direct borrowing from the Temple worship was even less possible than from that of the synagogue. There was no antagonism to Jewish sacrifices. Christ worshipped in the Temple and was not unwilling to pay the Temple tax. The early Christians frequented it daily, and even St. Paul saw no harm in paying for sacrifices with the express purpose of proving that he walked orderly and kept the law. But the system was unsuitable for Christian use. Animal sacrifice was already decadent and had provoked revolt even among the Jews. The law was also too saturated with nationalism to lend itself to catholic adaptation. Nevertheless the Old Testament principles of worship passed on into the

Christian Church, transfigured by the redemption which Christ had wrought.

The first of these was that worship is Eucharistic. To the Temple men did not come only to be edified or strengthened. They came to do homage to God, to offer to Him gifts expressive of their self-devotion and thanksgiving. Now the Christian Church, in addition to all the motives to Eucharistic worship which men possessed under the older dispensation, had the supreme new theme of praise, the redemption of the world by God upon the Cross. She needed first of all, some means of making a memorial before God of the sacrifice of Christ. We are familiar with the contention that the remembrance in the sacrament is before ourselves and the world. If that were true we should have to devise some other service for the memorial before God, with praise and thanksgiving, which is absolutely indispensable in the worship of Christendom. If "Jesus Christ and Him crucified" is the fundamental subject of all Christian preaching, the same must surely be true of Christian worship. *Lex credendi, lex orandi.*

But even in the old rites praise yielded to sacrifices of communion, and certainly this climax of worship could not be neglected by a Church which owed her existence to her union with God. The union required expression in worship. Thus the sacrament of Christ's body and blood was more than a means of grace. The fellowship with Christ was not only

a strengthening of the communicants. It was their highest joy and the satisfaction of their love for Him.

In the second place the Church learned from Judaism how to worship as one united body. From the representative services in the Temple, offered in the name of the whole nation by its authoritative ministry, she derived the conception of a corporate worship, made representative in exactly the same manner, by the authority conferred upon its ministers to act in her name. Again, the necessity for retaining the principle had been intensified. It was an expression of one aspect of the Christian losing of self. It is the essence of the Christian outlook to regard oneself as a member of a body. I must know myself as incomplete apart from the corporate life of the beloved community. When I worship it must be as one part of an universal harmony, one instrument, among and in unity with many, for offering not simply my own emotion and thought but those of the universal Church.

Thirdly, like the older worship, that of the Christian Church had to be expressed in action. Merely verbal worship was offered in the synagogue, but that which God commanded was of deeds rather than of words. There can scarcely be corporate worship without external expression, but the need for it is to be welcomed as a facility. Intense emotion demands gesture as well as words. Complete devotion must be of body as well as mind.

And also, as we have noticed already, the association of the lower nature with ourselves in worship is the recognition that they and we belong to the one creation of the one Creator Whom we adore.

Fourthly, the Jewish religion had adopted and developed the principle of symbolism. It is only so that the external action can be made worthy of inclusion in spiritual worship. The Jews had already made this great discovery, and Christ by His ordinance of sacraments had set His seal upon it. Our conviction that all creation is, at the heart of it, spiritual, compels us so to offer outward gifts to God. It is the expression of the deepest truth about them when we find in them signs of the divine handiwork, revelations of the divine character. Symbolism is thus no embroidery of a fanciful æstheticism. It is the natural language of the spiritual philosophy of religion.

We may add to these four lessons from Judaism another which was rightly derived from the Christian study of the Jewish law. They discovered that the whole was prophetic, and foretold the sacrifice of Christ. Similarly their own worship should be a foretaste of the glory that was to come at His second advent. It must speak of progress, of present imperfection, but of confident hope. This must not be a sighing for " Jerusalem the golden," and for the day when sacraments shall cease, if the Church was to practise patience and accept her present condition as the will of God for her. But

it allowed her to worship as one striving for perfection and pressing forward to a goal. Intercession, in fact, acquires a deeper character when to the spirit of a human benevolence is added the desire for such satisfaction of our needs and such perfecting of our life as will be the consummation of the purpose of God. We have introduced this principle here for the sake of completeness, but in reality the development of intercession, as the last possibility of our hours of worship, belongs to a time much later than the Apostolic age.

V

We have now to notice that it was not necessary for the Church to become explicitly conscious of the true ideals of worship, and then to devise forms in which they might be enshrined. From the first one provision of Christ Himself has determined the course which the development of Christian worship must follow. By His command the Church came together regularly for the breaking of bread. This name for the sacrament implies that communion was its chief purpose. For the association of the fraction with the violence done to our Lord's body on the Cross is a modern idea and, strictly speaking, unscriptural. The breaking in the New Testament and down to the period of the great liturgies was only the preliminary to the distribution of the bread.

But the simplest communion-meal must be preceded by prayer, as even an ordinary meal should be preceded by "grace." "Bless, O Lord, this food to our use," acquires a new meaning when we are to partake of spiritual food. The original consecration prayer may have been very like our own, that we receiving these creatures of bread and wine may be partakers of Christ's body and blood. The prayer must be answered through the operation of the Holy Ghost, and the invocation of Him in the later liturgies is a natural and legitimate development. But the earliest language was probably quite simple and untheological. Even from the first, however, it would have been natural, though it might not have been considered indispensable, to introduce the prayer for consecration by reciting the words of Christ at the institution of the Sacrament. For this was the Church's authority for expecting so great a boon. We may compare the Latin collect form, in which the propriety of the petition is based upon a preceding clause recalling some attribute of God or some promise that He has made. It is noteworthy that this feature occurs in both the public prayers preserved in the early chapters of Acts—that at the election of Matthias, and that for strength in persecution. It represents therefore an instinct of propriety already possessed by the Church. The fullness with which St. Paul describes the institution in 1 Cor. xi, is a striking departure from his ordinary custom, and may well

mean that it had already a place in his liturgical scheme.

But we may take a further step. The Holy Communion was never a mere symbolical meal, but from the first a Church service, a religious function. Bare reception, with merely an introductory prayer, would have been unsatisfying. Preliminary devotions were required, and what was more appropriate than thanksgiving for all God's goodness, but especially for His mercies in Christ? We have already pointed out that a Eucharistic memorial before God of all that Christ has accomplished for us was one of the prime requirements of Christian worship. St. Paul tells us that at Corinth there was a corporate giving of thanks, led by one voice and responded to by a congregational Amen. The conjunction of this with the breaking of bread—even if we deny that St. Paul referred exclusively to the Eucharistic thanksgiving—was too natural to be avoided. If we suppose that it came to be arranged in an ascending climax, beginning with praise for earthly blessings, continuing with a reference to the Incarnation, leading up to the already requisite account of the institution of the Sacrament, we shall at once have the " great thanksgiving " of the later liturgies. For logical consistency and the desire to preserve the climax would lead to the mention of the death and resurrection and ascension of Christ after, and not before, the institution, and so the *anamnesis* or special memorial

of the Redemption would fall into the place which it actually occupies. The genesis of the Eucharistic liturgy is therefore so natural that no formal action of the Church is required to account for its universal prevalence. It arose of necessity out of the historical and psychological situation.

Mere convenience would indeed be sufficient to secure, not only that the desired Eucharist was prefixed to the commanded communion, but also that when the whole community assembled for the breaking of bread, advantage should be taken of their meeting to provide for their edification. So, for example, the ordinary Sunday gathering at Troas gave an occasion for St. Paul to preach to them. Why should they be required to come twice or three times when all could be done at one service? Thus a service of instruction, the *missa catechumenorum*, was followed by the Eucharistic memorial, and that prepared for and led up to the reception of the communion. The order of the three was inevitable, because the approach to God must be from knowledge of Him to thanksgiving, and through that to union with Him.

We must notice, however, that while the instruction was only for convenience' sake, united with the Eucharist, the connection of the latter with the communion was extremely intimate. It may, in fact, be regarded as not much more than an expansion of the grace before the communion meal. Hence it was good to avoid the interruption which would

have been caused by bringing in the elements after the thanksgiving, and we find this, the offertory or great entrance,uniformly placed before the beginning of the thanksgiving. But the provision was not merely dictated by convenience. We have seen already that the worship of the Apostolic age had learned from Judaism the propriety of symbolical action as well as spoken words. The offertory at once became such an action, and this transformed the thanksgiving into a true worship by sacrifice. For the essence of sacrifice in the spiritual stage, which even later Judaism had reached, is to be a symbolical gift to God of some part of His gifts to us, made as significant of spiritual facts and spiritual oblation. The bread and wine, definitely offered to God as a memorial of Christ, are therefore properly and in the strictest sense sacrificial. This stage of thought had been reached by the Church at least as early as Clement of Rome, who describes the presbyters of Corinth as "those who have offered the gifts of the episcopate unblamably and holily." The words cannot mean, as the English translation conceivably might, "exercised episcopal gifts." The bishop's office was a holy offering of gifts to God. What gifts could there be whose oblation (not administration) was the primary function of the ministry, except those of the Eucharist, the celebration of which was the main *raison d'être* of bishops and deacons? Similarly in Justin, "the sacrifices which are being offered

by you Gentiles," are defined as " the bread of the Eucharist and the cup of the Eucharist."

It is in this sense that we are justified in attaching a sacrificial meaning to Christ's words, " Do this in remembrance, for a memorial, of Me." They cannot in themselves prove more than this. They certainly do not warrant the doctrine that the Body and Blood of Christ sacramentally present on the altar are to be offered to God; for even if that were a possible mode of making the memorial, it is, as we have just seen, not the only one, and the words are as applicable to a symbolical memorial, with still unconsecrated bread and wine, as to an oblation of Christ present in His sacrament. In the primitive liturgies, and in the Eastern Church down to the present time, the consecration completes the sacrifice. It does not, as the Romans and Tractarians say, supply us with a sacrifice to offer. But on the other hand, we cannot follow the modern commentators who see no Godward significance in the memorial. Even Gore says that, " The phrase in the *Anaphora* ' Therefore we remembering Thy (*sic*) blessed passion,' etc., implies that they understood our Lord's words to mean ' This do to remember me ' " (*The Body of Christ*, p. 315). But the phrase quoted is only the beginning of a sentence which goes on to say that according to the command of Christ we offer the elements to God. The Church, then, clearly believed that Christ's words, " Do this," commanded such an offering, made with a remem-

brance of the saving work of Christ, and therefore, as a memorial of Him. And the language, to conclude as Gore does, " probably goes back to very early times."

In the Gospel narrative of the Institution there are six recorded actions. Christ (1) took bread, (2) blessed or gave thanks, (3) brake it, (4) gave it to the disciples, (5) used words identifying it with His Body, (6) commanded us to do this in remembrance of Him. There is no need to mention the parallel actions for the cup. The fourth of the series is omitted by St. Paul, and perhaps he alone mentions the sixth. Otherwise the four accounts of the institution are so far identical. Moreover the first four actions reappear with the same formal brevity in the six accounts of the feeding of the multitudes (except that St. John omits " He brake ") and in that of the supper at Emmaus, narratives which were perhaps already regarded as symbolical of the Eucharist. Apparently they have, then, the character of a formula, and possibly from liturgical use. These actions and only these are selected because they describe the Eucharist, and at every Eucharist Christ the true High Priest repeats that which He did at its institution. Not only does He give us heavenly food, making the elements to be His Body and His Blood, but He gives thanks, presents our thanksgivings, so that the great thanksgiving is an integral part of the worship. In fact, St. Paul believes that the memorial is made in

obedience to His command given at the same time as the sacrament itself. And the material symbolism which makes the memorial a sacrifice is also under His Priesthood. At every Eucharist " Jesus takes the bread " at the offertory. This is part of that teaching concerning Christ's offering of our worship to which we have already referred. Irenæus, for instance, does not think of our worship as a merely earthly action dedicating to God ourselves, our prayers, and our earthly possessions. He says, " There is therefore an altar in heaven, for thither our prayers and our offerings are directed." There is such a union of heaven and earth that our centre for worship is not the visible altar in the Church, but, past it and by means of it, we lift our hearts to the heavenly altar in the presence of the Father, the throne of grace which is our altar's antitype. Hence the later liturgies, when they would pray that our incense, or our alms, or the Eucharist itself, may be accepted by God, ask that the offering may be borne up to the heavenly altar, adding often such a phrase as " by the ministry of Thy holy angels."

Thus in our Eucharist it is Christ Who offers and is offered. Throughout it also the angels ascend and descend upon the Son of Man. Our worship is not the counterpart or imitation of that of Heaven, but is identical with it. The door is open in Heaven and we see the vision of the Apocalypse. The living creatures join with us in singing the praise of our Creator, and we take on our lips their song of

" Holy, Holy, Holy." Then we go on to the new song, the praise for redemption, to Him that sitteth on the Throne and unto the Lamb. It is one congregation that worships, including not only the living creatures and the elders and the angels, but " every created thing which is in the Heaven and on the earth, and under the earth and on the sea, and all things that are in them."

The close connection of this vision with the Eucharist has often been noticed. Since the partial acceptance of the Revelation in the early Church does not permit us to think that the liturgy was founded upon it, we must suppose that the vision is the transfigured representation of the liturgy, and that already, at least in Ephesus, the great thanksgiving had received its systematic arrangement in two divisions, separated by the *Tersanctus*—first the hymn of creation, and secondly the hymn of the redeemed. The main outline of the Eucharistic scheme—offertory, thanksgiving, memorial, consecration, communion, with probably the introductory service of edification—dates from the Apostolic age.

LECTURE VI

EUCHARIST AND MASS

"What shall I render unto the Lord for all His benefits toward me? I will take the cup of salvation, and call upon the name of the Lord."—Ps. cxvi. 12.

I

From the time of the apostles, we have seen, the Church has possessed in the Eucharist a combination of the three essential services of worship. It has been a service of instruction, an offering of thanksgiving and praise for all God's mercies, but especially for redemption through the Cross of Christ, and a service of sacramental communion in obedience to our Lord's command. We have seen also that, while the first of these, the *missa catechumenorum*, was but slightly attached to the Eucharist, and remained throughout the history a subordinate ministration, the second and third, the Eucharist and the Communion, were closely knit together by the oblation of the elements of the Communion before the Eucharist began. This was, in fact, necessary because the ordinance of the Communion was not the least among the subjects of thanksgiving; because the latter was from the

first introductory to Communion; and because, on the other hand, Communion is the climax of worship. The unity was, therefore, a spiritual reality and not the result of ecclesiastical habit. But the offertory before thanksgiving altered the character of the thanksgiving. It became a sacrifice—worship of which the verbal and spiritual offering is symbolised and defined by a material gift to God visibly uniting the congregation in a corporate action. Nor was this an accidental outcome of the Church's practice. It satisfied the ever-present, one might almost say instinctive, craving for sacrificial worship.

The primitive liturgical scheme was preserved intact in the great liturgies of the patristic age. The account of it given by Justin Martyr is an important link between the New Testament and the fourth century, when for the first time our information becomes abundant. In his writings we can discover the four divisions of a liturgy: the *missa catechumenorum*, the proanaphoral preparations, the *anaphora* and the Communion. The first of these, he tells us, contained sections from the Old and New Testaments, an exhortation by the celebrant, and intercessory prayers. The preparations of the second part were the kiss of peace and the bringing in of the bread and the mixed chalice. The *anaphora* consisted of prayers and a long thanksgiving by the celebrant, to which the congregation responded "Amen"—a response to which Justin appears to attach importance. At

the end of the *anaphora* the elements are regarded as consecrated, and nothing further is mentioned except the Communion, administered by deacons, who also bear the elements to those who are unavoidably absent. The account ends, it is true, with a mention of almsgiving, but this, it would seem, is not yet included in the liturgy.

The consecration of the elements is affirmed in unmistakable terms. They are no longer "common bread and drink," but the flesh and blood of the incarnate Jesus. When and by what means was the change effected? They are the bread and wine "over which the thanksgiving was pronounced," a phrase which shows that the *anaphora* as a whole is thought of as a thanksgiving, or Eucharist, but does not assert that the thanksgiving effected consecration. Christ's institution and express words are the ground of our faith in the change, but the recital of them is not said to be the means by which it is effected. It is probable that the recital occurred, because Justin gives the Gospel language as if he were repeating a familiar and appropriate formula, and because amongst the subjects of thanksgiving he mentions "our being counted worthy to receive these things" (the elements) "at His hands." There was, therefore, thanksgiving for the institution of the sacrament. But the food is blessed "by the prayer of the word which is from Him," a phrase about whose meaning one hesitates to dogmatise, but which

probably means "the prayer of the Divine Logos" —either a prayer given by Him or one about Him, an invocation of the Logos, such as we find afterwards in Sarapion. Just now we only need to notice that the consecration which is recognised as the end of the thanksgiving, and is authorised by the institution of Christ, is effected by prayer. To complete our survey of Justin we must add that the thanksgiving, which included thanks for our spiritual food, by no means confined itself to that. It "gave praise and glory to the Father of the universe, through the name of the Son and of the Holy Ghost," and it was prescribed "in remembrance of the suffering which Christ endured in order that we may at the same time thank God for having created the world, with all things therein, for the sake of man, and for delivering us from the evil in which we were, and for utterly overthrowing principalities and powers by Him who suffered according to His will." We do not know the order in which these subjects were mentioned, but there is no reason to suppose that it differed from the rational one which afterwards prevailed—namely, thanksgiving for creation, for redemption and for the sacrament, memorial of Christ, prayer of consecration.

We must notice also that two great features of the Eucharist as we find it in later times are not mentioned by Justin. He has no oblation of the consecrated elements, as the Roman Church now

has, and he has no intercession in the Eucharist itself, as the whole Church has. His silence means that these did not exist in his day. For we cannot ascribe it to carelessness in a description that is otherwise so graphic and so clear, nor can we suppose that such important elements were omitted for shortness from an account that mentions the mixture of the chalice and the kiss of peace. Nor, again, can we attribute it to reverential reserve in view of the fulness with which he treats the belief in the real Presence. Justin's liturgy was, therefore, not the Roman Mass, in which the oblation after consecration is regarded as essential, and the intercession scarcely less so, since it is a sacrifice for the quick and the dead.

The Eastern liturgies, on the other hand, may be regarded as a natural and inevitable development from such a simple service as Justin describes. The development was, in the first place, one of accessory ceremonial and ancillary prayers. It is especially marked in the *missa catechumenorum*, where the lections became fewer and shorter, the sermons were often omitted, and even the intercessions showed signs of decadence. The cause was that the service was becoming, more and more, preliminary to the Eucharist which followed. Introductory prayers appeared, and became sometimes so long as to change the whole effect of the *missa catechumenorum* and to disguise its original character. Meanwhile, certain important move-

ments were glorified so as to become stately processions. These were the entrance of the minister, the going forth of the deacon to read the gospel, and the great entrance, or bringing in of the elements. Round the latter clustered ceremonies denoting the spiritual preparation of the communicants. The kiss of peace, signifying their unity and brotherly love, had already appeared in Justin's time, and, indeed, had an apostolic origin. The lavabo testified their need of cleansing penitence, and the creed, at a later period still, expressed their common faith. The reading of the diptychs was intended to announce the special intention of the celebration, to suggest to the worshippers the special persons, living or departed, whom they were to pray for, or whose fellowship they were especially to remember.

In the same way the Communion demanded certain accompaniments. Preparatory prayers of humility were naturally offered, and the Lord's Prayer was used, it would seem, originally with a similar purpose. The fraction prepared the bread for distribution, and the commixture, or consignation, perhaps symbolised the fact that the spiritual food which we receive is the risen and living Christ. After the Communion, thanksgiving for it was the natural instinct of piety. But while every other part of the service thus developed in complexity and symbolical enrichment, the *anaphora* remained in its simplicity. Its language became

more definite and more theological, but it continued to be a great thanksgiving leading to consecratory prayer. The only important change in it was the development of the great Eucharistic intercession.

Justin, as we have seen, confined intercession to the prayers of the faithful which ended the *missa catechumenorum*. After his time we get the reading of the diptychs, which were not prayers, but at most invitations to pray. Nevertheless, prayer tended to make its appearance in connection with them, as two very ancient rites testify. In the Nestorian liturgy the people answer "Amen" as they hear the names, and this involves a mental assent which is virtually prayer. In the Gallican liturgy the celebrant actually said an intercessory prayer, the *collectio post nomina*, after the reading of the diptychs. For a brief period in Egypt, as Sarapion's prayer-book shows, and very probably also at Rome, a full intercession accompanied or followed the diptychs in their original position after the offertory, but this practice yielded to the development shortly to be described. The same sources point to the occurrence of intercession immediately after the prayer of consecration. That prayer generally ended with petitions for the communicants, that they might make a good Communion, and it was natural that prayers of a more general character should be added for them. Also it was inevitable that the communicants should wish to remember those who had been their

fellow-worshippers, but had departed before them into Paradise. With these they desired to express continued fellowship. It is precisely for these two classes, for those that bring the offerings and for the departed, that Sarapion and the Roman liturgy made prayers after the consecration.

In the fourth century there arose a desire for fuller intercessions in close connection with the Eucharistic worship. Cyril of Jerusalem speaks of them as made over the sacrifice, and in the Coptic liturgy of St. Mark the same phrase is used. It meant that the prayers were explicitly based upon the pleading of Christ's Sacrifice and offered in union with His heavenly intercession, or, as the Fathers would more probably have expressed it, presented by Him at the heavenly altar. For this purpose the intercession must be placed at least after the great entrance. The first device, of uniting it with the diptychs immediately after that point, failed to commend itself, no doubt because the intercession could not fitly be classed with exercises of a preparatory character. In the end the Roman and Egyptian Churches found a place for it in the thanksgiving, or what ought to have been the thanksgiving. It was just because it had unfortunately been allowed to subside into prayer that it afforded a point of attachment for the intercession, and thereby it lost still more of its proper Eucharistic character. In Asia the place for the insertion was discovered after the consecration,

where the prayer for the communicants suggested intercession. Perhaps it displaced an already existing short form such as occurs in Sarapion, for the Armenian liturgy has an intercession which reads like an amalgamation of two original ones. Even the Asiatic plan is open to criticism. The separation of the Communion from the Eucharistic worship seems to be another symptom of the depreciation of it which was already leading to attendance without Communion. The reproaches of Chrysostom were justified, for this practice involves a failure to understand the full significance of Communion as the climax of worship. Union with Christ is the highest reward of adoring love, and thus the praise of the Eucharist is incomplete unless it leads on to Communion. Nothing should have been allowed to turn the worshipper aside from that onward sweep of his spiritual momentum towards God. But, thinking of Communion only as a means of grace and benefit to themselves, men were content to wait for it until they had first considered the needs of other men. Yet it is as united with Christ that we become entitled in the fullest sense to act as intercessors. It is, therefore, rather remarkable and to be regretted that no part of the Church thought of placing the intercession after the Communion. The whole service would then rehearse in due course our redemption by Christ's death, of which we offer a thankful memorial: our fellowship in His risen Life, which is signified and

effected in the Communion; and our privilege of co-activity with His heavenly Priesthood, which we accomplish by partaking in His work of intercession.

The ancient Church, it appears, found considerable difficulty in making a place for the intercession in a service already so rationally and closely knit together that an interruption of its course was a calamity. But our novel solution, which is no interruption, is also theoretically the correct one. For the proper position of intercessory prayer is the end of the service. In the intensity of her worshipping Communion with God the Church loses herself and forgets her needs. The all-sufficiency of God, who has done so great things for her already, fills her mind—until she loses sight even of that in the contemplation of His excellencies and in joyful union with Him. For the moment the world of sorrows, toil and temptation ceases to exist. But the time comes quickly when the burden of it must be resumed. Our needs and our weaknesses again come into view, and we make our petitions to God that He will go forth with us into the world, to be our Helper and Defence. Then it is that we commend the world to His government and His pity. Prayer is thus the transition from worship to the secular life. Our own Prayer Book exemplifies this in the daily offices and the occasional services. The position of the prayer for the Church militant, also, is probably not an imitation, as some have thought, of the Eastern deacon's prayers at the

offertory. Rather it means that already in 1552 the Church despaired of frequent celebrations, and put the intercession at the end of the ante-communion which would be the normal Sunday service.

There is, of course, a second possible position for intercession : at the beginning of the service—the transition from the secular life to worship. We bring with us the life out of which we have come, with its burdens and anxieties, and also with its disqualifying sinfulness. The consequences in the system of the liturgy are, first, the statement of special intentions, and, secondly, penitential devotions, with which our worship always naturally begins. For intercession, however, we stand by our own Prayer Book, in preference to any of the expedients of the ancient liturgies, but with the qualification that under our present conditions the need for the proanaphoral position of the intercession has disappeared, and it would be wholly in accordance with Anglican principles to remove it to the position after the Communion.

We cannot take leave of the subject without noticing that the fourth century innovation, of prayers over the sacrifice, involved a development of thought regarding the sacrifice itself. What had been chiefly or solely a thankful memorial became a pleading of Christ's death. The Eucharist was made into a sacrifice of prayer. But this was inevitable even on the least mystical conception of its nature. Think of it only as a remembrance,

a symbolical holding-up of Christ to the Father. Our first purpose may be thanksgiving, but we cannot keep out of our minds our present need of Christ, and of the forgiveness and grace that come to us through Him. Every prayer is made "through Jesus Christ our Lord," and the Eucharist, so considered, is, so to speak, an inversion of our ordinary prayers. That which in them is a closing phrase of pleading becomes here the explicit subject of our liturgy, but that which in them occupies the body of the prayer must still appear, if only as a closing intercession. Think again of the Sacrament as one in which Christ is our strength and refreshment, and we must remember that no union with Him will be of value which does not finally issue in union of character. We cannot forget or neglect to mention our brethren's needs, if we are to be one with Him who loved us and gave Himself for us. We are not one with Him if we cannot join in His unfailing intercession for His own. If we go on to more mystical ideas of the nature of the Eucharistic sacrifice, the propriety of intercession will certainly not become less. On every ground the fourth-century development was a legitimate and even necessary one.

II

We may now turn to the other omission which we noticed in Justin. He makes no mention of an

oblation of the consecrated elements; that is to say, of Christ sacramentally present on the altar. Of this the New Testament also says nothing. Neither do any of the great liturgies, except that of Rome. We might, therefore, dismiss it as a local peculiarity of the Roman Church, were it not that upon it depends the Western theory of the sacrifice of the Mass, held in an expurgated form by the most influential school of thought in the Anglican Church of to-day. Its importance requires us to deal with it more fully than the authority alleged for its support would otherwise demand.

The early history of the Roman canon is one of the most debatable subjects of liturgiology. Fortunately, we do not have to enter into the details of the controversy, which is largely due to the vitiated methods of German literary criticism. But certain points must be explained. The Roman canon depends upon a Greek original, of which it must be practically a translation. The Greek liturgical style differs widely from the Latin. English Churchmen may compare the Greek *Gloria in excelsis* with the Latin *Te Deum*. The Latin style has a conciseness which is often epigrammatic, and sometimes meagre. The Greek is florid, and delights in an accumulation of divine titles and synonyms, or words nearly synonymous. In the Roman canon there are many sentences which by their style betray their Greek original. Such are "Te igitur supplices rogamus ac petimus uti

accepta habeas et benedicas hæc dona, hæc munera, hæc sancta sacrificia illibata," and "quam oblationem . . . benedictam, adscriptam, ratam, rationabilem, acceptabilemque," and "de tuis donis ac datis, Hostiam puram, Hostiam sanctam, Hostiam immaculatam," and "per quem . . . creas, sanctificas, vivificas, benedicis et præstas nobis." There are no similar expressions in other parts of the liturgy, such as *memento* and *diesque nostros*, which are known to be indigenous. Secondly, we cannot suppose that the Greek original was the apostolic or sub-apostolic liturgy of Rome, because there is no trace of liturgical fixity of language at that early date. The close correspondence of the canon with Egyptian liturgies rather points to borrowing from that country in the fourth century, or not much earlier. We can give a reason for such borrowing if the Roman Church had previously used such variable forms as all other Churches of the West possessed, and abandoned them in favour of a fixed liturgy in the fourth century, just as the others did afterwards through the influence of Charlemagne. It would account for her drawing attention to the fixity of her form by calling it the canon.

The third point is that the Roman canon, when first introduced, had, like all Greek forms, a prayer of consecration, and did not regard the recital of the words of institution as the means by which consecration was effected. It seems even to have

had, as Greek liturgies from the fourth century generally do, an invocation of the Holy Ghost. For Pope Gelasius (492–496) writes: "How shall the heavenly Spirit who is invoked come to the consecration of the divine mystery, if the priest who prays Him to be present is condemned as full of evil deeds?" Almost the same language is used by Jerome, who was probably (though in view of his residence in Palestine not certainly) referring to the Roman liturgy. The African Church was closely related to that of Rome, and there Fulgentius wrote, in the middle of the fifth century: "When more suitably than for the consecration of the sacrifice of the body of Christ, may the holy Church seek the coming down of the Holy Spirit." Where, we must ask, in the canon did this invocation occur? A fragment of an Egyptian liturgy shows that conceivably it might have been placed before the words of institution, but this is most unlikely. For one thing, the fragment is unique among Greek forms, and, as we have not the whole of it, we are not even certain that it had not a second invocation in the usual place after the *anamnesis*, which would then be the actual moment of consecration. Besides this, we have, in the *De Sacramentis*, a fragment of an early Latin liturgy which was probably identical with that of Rome, and which has no invocation before the institution. It stops short before quoting the end of the paragraph "Supplices te rogamus," which

would be the normal position for an invocation. But the most conclusive of arguments is that the existing language of the Roman *anamnesis* really implies that the elements have not yet been consecrated. For bread and wine can be presented to God as an offering " de tuis donis ac datis," but in what sense can an offering of Christ Himself be so described? And, a little later, God is asked to accept this sacrifice as He accepted those of Abel, Abraham and Melchisedech—language quite fitting if it refers to bread and wine symbolically offered, but quite unfit, and almost blasphemous, if it refers to Christ's Body and Blood. Moreover, the prayer that the elements may be borne by the angel to the heavenly altar is itself a prayer of consecration, or preparatory to one of a more theological character. We conclude, therefore, that when it was first used the Roman canon had a form of consecration somewhere about the paragraph " Supplices te rogamus." Therefore the oblation made in the *anamnesis* was one of the earthly gifts and made with a view to their consecration. There was not, at Rome any more than elsewhere, an oblation of Christ sacramentally present.

But meanwhile there was a school of theologians in Italy who taught that the true moment of consecration was the recital of the institution. Ambrose and the Ambrosian author of the *De Sacramentis* took this view. They said that Christ's own words were used, and rightly used, for the consecration.

So they might have been if they had been preserved. But in the Gospels the words, "This is My Body," and "This is My Blood," are not words of consecration, but of administration—those with which Christ delivered the elements to His disciples. Thus Ambrose and his followers were wrong in their facts, and their theory was also wrong. We cannot approve it because the Church of England, in her directions for a second consecration, seems to accept it—without any examination of the question that has come down to us. It has no basis in Scripture, and no support from Catholic tradition, except the late and local use of Rome. It is unchristian in spirit, for the use of a formula suggests magical action by the priest. Our part in the consecration, if Christ by the Holy Spirit is the true Agent, is simply prayer. We should not claim to work a miracle by the recital of the correct form of words, as if they were a charm. Perhaps it was largely the heathen leaven in the Roman community that led to the gradual acceptance of the Ambrosian view. As we have seen, Pope Gelasius, a century after Ambrose, adhered to Catholic doctrine, but in the end the victory of the formula theory was complete.

Now, Ambrose and his followers do not appear to have contemplated any doctrinal change as regards the sacrifice. They did not teach the earlier moment of consecration in order to turn the *anamnesis* into an oblation of Christ's Body

and Blood. That result may be called purely accidental, and probably the full bearing of it was not at first perceived, although the new oblation is the essence of the Roman Sacrifice of the Mass, in which the priest offers Christ, sacramentally present, for the quick and the dead. The Roman canon was not drawn up to enshrine the doctrine as one already taught; but the canon, stupidly misunderstood and afterwards slightly altered to suit the misunderstanding, became the teacher of the mass-doctrine. Priests learned that their great object in the Mass was to sacrifice Christ, because the canon of the Mass, as they understood it, ordered them to do so continually. The origin of the Roman Mass was thus as ignoble as its fruits were disastrous.

The same Church which came to accept the Mass was simultaneously learning to accept that theory of the Atonement which we have called the Latin assumption. They were learning that the Father had to be placated by the death of Christ—the reparation for sin made by humanity in the Person of Christ. The two beliefs went well together. If Christ on the Cross offered Himself as a gift of such value that the Father was thereby placated, why should He not repeat the placation as often as men sin? Even granting that the one Satisfaction was sufficient for the sins of the whole world, why should not the sufficiency of it be continually represented to the Father as the need for it arose,

and the representation have a truly placatory effect? Or, in closer agreement with the mediæval language, if the sufferings of Christ were meritorious and deserved salvation for us, why should not His self-humiliation in being present in the Eucharist be similarly meritorious? Thus, "His saving merit might be applied for the remission of those sins which are daily committed by us." Why, indeed, should we stop short of that repudiated mediæval teaching, that the Cross was for the forgiveness of original sin, the Mass for the forgiveness of actual sin?

"Since in the divine sacrifice which is enacted in the Mass the same Christ is contained and is bloodlessly immolated, Who on the Altar of the Cross once offered Himself through blood (*cruente*), the Sacred Synod teaches that that sacrifice is truly propitiatory, and that through it it comes to pass . . . that we obtain mercy and find grace to help in time of need. Placated by the oblation of it, the Lord grants grace and the gifts of penitence, and forgives crimes and even the greatest sins" (*Conc. Trid. Sessio*, xxii., c. 2).

If I have committed a great sin I may offer the Mass, and God will be placated. If one Mass has not sufficient merit I may offer two or a hundred. True, that a right disposition of heart is necessary, as it is also for receiving benefit from Christ's death. True, that the Mass is dependent upon the Cross, but it is not so dependent as not to be a true and proper sacrifice. The merits of Christ

which were offered for me upon the Cross are offered for me also in the Mass, by which I obtain mercy and find grace. Nothing can prevent this theory from making the Mass a repetition of Christ's act in dying for us. Yet why should I object to the repetition? Once grant that Christ's act was a placation of the Father through the offering of His humanity, and the whole theory becomes rational and beautifully logical—though it is a large result to follow as an unexpected consequence of tampering with the Eucharistic liturgy. The reformers rejected it because it contradicted Scripture, and so it does. But if our reason leads logically to an unscriptural consequence, it becomes us to reconsider our premises—in this case the Latin view of the Atonement.

III

The first thought of the Anglican reformers was, most naturally, repudiation of the Mass and all its attendant iniquities, and ever since the Reformation there has been a large section of the Church of England which either contents itself with denying that the Eucharist is a sacrifice at all, or admits the term in a metaphorical sense, and really as applying to things done in the course of the Eucharist —almsgiving, praise and self-devotion. But to Catholic minds the witness of all antiquity is irresistible. Hence, from the seventeenth century onwards, there has been an increasing adherence

to a novel theory of the sacrifice which is at first sight attractive. It is that, as Christ ever presents Himself before the Father in continuous sacrifice, as a Victim slain for man, so we on earth offer Him to the Father. Adherents of this view seek for the reinsertion in our service of the Roman oblation of the consecrated elements. We call the theory a novel one, although indications of it are to be found in Ambrose and perhaps elsewhere. For it has by no means the position which Dr. Darwell Stone would give it, as a real, though subordinate, element of the Catholic tradition. When Irenæus or Origen speak of Christ's offering in Heaven, they are not thinking of a presentation of Himself for us, but of His presentation (as the High Priest of our offerings) of our human prayers, praises and good deeds. A passage in Œcumenius shows how easily such language may be misleading.

"He died that He might offer the sacrifice, and He rose from the dead and ascended into Heaven that He might have Heaven as His dwelling-place where He must offer sacrifice. And by offering sacrifice understand His intercession on our behalf" (Darwell Stone, i., p. 156).

Had he not added the last sentence this would have been unimpeachable witness to Christ's heavenly sacrifice. If we put aside both those passages of the Fathers which really speak of Christ presenting our worship and those which refer to His intercession, there are very few left to support

the Anglican theory. Moreover, we have already proved that there is no scriptural authority for it. And we can easily show that it is also theologically unsound. It is perfectly true that we need to plead the Sacrifice of the death of Christ. Conscious of our imperfect union with Him, of our defiling sins, of our need of a greater fullness of His life in us, we come to God in a spirit of humility and hunger, and we come with a faithful confidence in the sufficiency of Christ's Atonement and of our acceptance in Him. From the moment of the offertory we have been implicitly setting forth the death of Christ, as the plea trusting in which we have boldness before the throne of grace. But the consecration means that our pleading has been accepted. When the fire of the Holy Ghost descends from heaven upon our sacrifice, it is the witness to God's favour and goodness towards us. Faith demands that pleading should yield to grateful and wondering adoration. "What shall I render to the Lord for all the benefits that He hath done unto me? I will receive the cup of salvation and call upon the name of the Lord." Even on the hypothesis of the Latin theory of Atonement, how can God be placated by this sacrifice, of Christ sacramentally present, when the presence is the proof that He is already placated? How can we offer the fruits of the Atonement here offered to us by God, as a pleading that He will have respect to the Atonement?

But although many Anglicans claim that they accept the Roman sacrifice of the Mass, and that the Church of England only repudiated abuses connected with it, further consideration of the way in which they treat it practically seems to show that they do not go so far. They teach that the Eucharist is an applicative Sacrifice, and therefore as an instrument propitiatory; that is to say, that the sacrifice which redeemed the world is here made effectual to us individually. But how is it made effectual? Partly through the communion, and in that, we believe, is to be found the true sacrament of propitiation. But also partly by way of intercession. And what is it that entitles us to be intercessors? Is it that we have celebrated the Eucharist, and thereby placated God? The Council of Trent says "Yes." But I do not find that Anglicans of repute assent to the Council. I think that they really believe that the ultimate ground of our intercession is the Atonement made on the Cross, while the proximate ground is our union with Christ, entitling us to do on earth what He does in Heaven. Therefore for this most solemn of all intercessions it becomes us first to plead the Atonement, and then, when the consecration assures us afresh of its perfect and full sufficiency, to assume the function which has been granted to us and unite ourselves with the work of our heavenly High Priest. But for this no oblation of Christ, as in the Roman liturgy, is at all necessary, for us

any more than for the Greeks. The utmost that we can claim as suitable language is the remembrance in the intercession itself that we only dare to make it because Christ has died for us. So we find that Greek liturgies, as early as the Clementine, alternate "we beseech Thee" in the intercession with "we offer to Thee," or "we offer to Thee this reasonable service on behalf of" (for example) "Thy holy Church." The difference between this and the Roman oblation should be obvious. The real Presence of Christ in the Eucharist is for the Romans a plea before God, a privilege granted by Christ to us wherewith to placate God, a sacrifice to offer Him. It is for us and for the Greeks a means of union with Christ, and a pledge of so close a union that we may venture to take our part in His priestly intercession.

The fact is that Anglican Churchmen who were dissatisfied with Protestant negations have generally turned to Rome for more adequate guidance, and have too readily accepted as Catholic what is really as local and, in the old sense, as "heretical" as their own traditions. The Roman Mass is the most peculiar, and therefore the least Catholic, of all ancient liturgies. The Tractarians, who were not liturgiologists, have popularised its most uncatholic peculiarity. But wherever unbiassed and wide study has been undertaken by our scholars, they have seen that Rome is a blind guide and that it is the Eastern Church which knows how to

offer the Eucharist. This is especially true of those Scottish divines, taught themselves apparently by the Non-jurors, whose devout learning is enshrined in the liturgy of their Church, and less perfectly in that of the United States. They turned the beginning of the English consecration prayer into an orthodox thanksgiving, and, as they had abandoned the Italian error that the words of the institution are words of consecration, they were able to make a proper memorial and oblation with elements still unconsecrated, though solemnly identified as symbols with the Body and Blood of Christ. The consecration prayer followed this, as it always should, and they did not cease from prayer and oblation until they had commended to God the Church and all estates of men in it.

In comparison with the Scottish liturgy the Roman Mass is as feeble and unsatisfying to the devout worshipper as it is pernicious and uncatholic in doctrine.

It is necessary for us, however, to turn our thoughts directly to the Greek writers, and not to content ourselves with what the Scottish divines have learned from them. Here, then, is what Cabasilas writes about the present activity of Christ in our behalf which is the foundation of Eucharistic doctrine.

"He is the Mediator through whom all good things given to us by God have come, or rather they are ever being given. For He did not once

for all mediate and deliver to us all for which He mediated and then depart, but He is ever a Mediator, not by words and supplications, as are ambassadors, but by act."

At this point, if Cabasilas had been a Roman, he must have introduced the sacrifice of the Mass in which Christ continually placates the Father, or if he had been a Tractarian, he must have spoken of His continual pleading of His death in Heaven. But instead of that he continues as follows—

"And what is the act? It is His uniting us to Himself, and His bestowing on us through Himself His own gifts according to each one's desert and the measure of His cleansing. . . . He it is Who alone reconciles to God, Who makes this peace, apart from Whom there is no hope for those who are at enmity with God to receive any of His good things. . . . What is it that reconciles God to the nature of man? Assuredly that He sees His beloved Son as man. So also He is reconciled to each individual man, if one wears the form of the Only Begotten, and bears His body, and is seen to be one Spirit with Him" (in Darwell Stone, ii., p. 170).

Thus the applicative sacrifice is the partaking of the communion, with that spiritual communion of which it is the sign and means and pledge.

But Cabasilas does not neglect the benefit of the Eucharist to others than communicants. "It sanctifies," he says, "by way of intercession both the dead and the living, by way of communion the living only." But he knows nothing of benefits from the oblation of a sacramentally present Christ,

unless that is included in the intercession—which would perhaps satisfy an Anglican, but is not what the Roman means by the sacrifice of the Mass.

On the other hand, the view that we have so far been taking would not satisfy the Easterns. They definitely repudiate the idea that there is no more in the Eucharistic sacrifice than a memorial of Christ, made by symbols of bread and wine and by words of pleading and thanksgiving. Yet one looks in vain in their liturgies for anything more. The apparent contradiction is to be reconciled, so far as I am able to understand with the imperfect information obtainable in Australia, by a very striking aspect of their teaching. So far as the Eucharist is a human work, they would, apparently, accept our description of it as adequate. Its inadequacy is simply that we have so entirely treated it as human. To the Easterns it is, before all things, a work of Christ Himself. He it is Who offers and is offered. In the Eucharist, they say, Christ is really present, not because of magical or supernatural powers in the priest, but because of His voluntary action through the Holy Spirit. And thus His presence is a real self-oblation to fulfil the Father's purpose for us. It is a similar oblation to that which He made when for our salvation He was made man and gave Himself to die upon the Cross. It is, indeed, the same oblation, made in the same eternal spirit, and it manifests the same obedience to the Father, the same love

for men, the same readiness to humble Himself. He Who was conceived by the Holy Ghost, here by the same Holy Ghost condescends to grant us His presence under the species of bread and wine. He Who devoted Himself upon the Cross, in perfect obedience to the Father and for the accomplishment of His will for man, here offers Himself to perfect that work in us. The sacrifice of the Eucharist is the same as that of the Cross. And yet they are different, inasmuch as that made Him one with us in order that this may make us one with Him. It is obvious that this conception does not require the oblation after consecration, and, indeed, cannot admit it. The consecration itself is the oblation, and made, not by us, but by Christ Himself.

"When the words of consecration have been said, the whole of the priestly rite has been accomplished and completed, the gifts have been consecrated and the sacrifice has been perfected, and the great Sacrifice and Victim, which was slain for the sake of the world, is seen to lie on the Holy Table" (Cabasilas, in Darwell Stone, i., p. 167).

The religious beauty and depth of this mystical doctrine of the Eucharist must commend themselves to all devout hearts. Nor does it, as might appear at first sight, make the Eucharist so entirely Christ's act as to destroy its utility and power as the Church's act. We need a sacrifice which will be our own, expressing our gratitude and praise and love. We cannot allow even Christ to do for

us what must be the expression of the worship of our own spirits, although, on the other hand, we cannot offer acceptable worship except in and through Christ. Christ, shall we say, vouchsafes us just that share as fellow-labourers with Him in worship, that we have in evangelisation. The missionary goes forth to regenerate men by preaching and baptising, and yet he is nothing and it is God that giveth the increase. Or a child is brought into the world by the act and from the substance of its parents, and yet it is by the creative power of God that another son and servant comes into existence for ever. So it is with the Eucharist. We can speak of "our sacrifice," just as we speak of "our converts" and "our sons." For Christ is its true Priest and Victim, but He only so offers Himself when the Church comes together for worship, and when she provides bread and wine and offers them for His using, and when by her priest she utters the consecrating prayer. This particular mode of His self-offering He so far puts into our keeping. Great is the Church's privilege and responsibility, great also is the office of her sacerdotal ministry, and yet we are ever to remember the reality and pre-eminence of the priestly presence of Christ. Instead of saying with the Latins that the human priest mystically immolates Christ, we shall use the Eastern formula, "He it is Who offers and is offered."

How far this Eastern doctrine would be accept-

able to English Churchmen is doubtful. To appreciate it perhaps requires some share of the Eastern temperament. But it is to be noticed that not even they assert it in the liturgy. The words we use express the human action in the worship, and the matter-of-fact person who only hears what is audible and only sees what is visible need not be expected to find more there than human words and actions. The aim of the Church must be to unite at one altar the mystic and the plain man. Indeed, our own Church needs to consider men whose doctrine of the Presence varies very greatly, and therefore those who might understand and yet reject the Eastern teaching, as well as those who cannot understand it. We must provide for the united worship of all who acknowledge a true feeding of our souls with the spiritual food of the Body and Blood of Christ. And there seems no reason why all should not use such a liturgy as the Eastern and the Scottish and the American Churches use, if once they see that it is not the Roman Mass, but the surest safeguard against it. For that the Church of England did in the sixteenth century repudiate the Mass is undeniable in the face of the known convictions of those who published the Prayer Book and the Articles. They may have been wrong, but most of us think they were right and mean to adhere to their teaching. And what makes the Mass is the oblation of the consecrated elements. That is not catholic or primitive. It is

the unwarranted peculiarity of a local Church, which, through a combination of circumstances, has unfortunately spread through Western Europe, and acquired a vogue altogether unmerited by its origin and incommensurate with its value.

LECTURE VII

THE ART OF WORSHIP

"Things new and old."—St. Matt. xiii. 52.

We began our subject by deploring the decay of worship. We must end by considering, in the light of our conclusions with respect to the Atonement and to the Eucharistic Sacrifice, under what conditions there is hope of its restoration. From the first we saw that as worship is directed towards God and indeed involves the losing of self in God, that religion only is likely to beget worship which is itself theocentric. Nature, in so far as we rest in its beauty, leads only to æsthetic gratification. Viewed as a manifestation of its Divine Source it must lead to worship. Humanity, in so far as we are only concerned with its ideal perfection, evokes effort and may be the cause of pride, if we dwell only upon its achievements, or of pessimism, if we reflect upon its failures. But, considered as the outcome of God's eternal purpose to be fulfilled in man, it leads to self-devotion and consecration. Its achievement calls for thanksgiving, its failure for humility and prayers for grace. Theology must become again what its name implies. Our minds

must be directed to the contemplation of God, in Whom all that is in us and around us must be seen. Then we shall have satisfied the first prerequisite of worship.

When we attempt to do this, the professor of Christianity cannot stop short of the contemplation of God in Christ. That personal revelation of the Father gives a far truer insight into His nature and His mind towards us than can be given by all the world besides. The divine redemption of mankind was the inauguration of a new creation in which all things are of God. Turning resolutely away from any teaching that bids us see in it, first and foremost, the work of man—even of the ideal Man and the Representative of ideal humanity—we find in it the supreme witness to the love and wisdom, the power and righteousness of God. We may be quite certain that it is impossible for us to devise a more inspiring theme of worship than that which the Christian Church has ever had in Christ, and has expressed in her Eucharist. Other foundation for worship can no man lay than that which is laid, even Jesus Christ. It is to the worship of the Eucharist that we must recall, first, our professing Christians, with a view finally to unite all men in adoring worship at the one great altar.

Our complaint was that especially public worship is neglected by our people. The corrective appears to be that they should be brought to realise how close a bond their regeneration in Christ may be. It

transcends all differences of race, and grades of social employment, and degrees of education, all barriers of sex and age; for to be in Christ or not in Christ is a distinction that strikes deeper than any of these. There must be in public worship some value that is impossible for our secret devotions. It is, first of all, this: that here we are united with the whole family of God. The Eucharist must express exactly that pre-eminence. In the sixteenth century there seems to have been an attempt to gather for each celebration the whole body of the faithful in a neighbourhood, so that as far as possible the whole Church might be said to be present. But it never can be, except approximately, and in any case the method involves the further error of congregational completeness, the Independent view of the Church, which is satisfied with local unity, separate localities being linked only by ties of sympathy and a like faith. But what we are in search of is an expression of the unity of the whole Body of Christ, and there was ready to hand in the first century a means of attaining it. For the temple worship of the Jews at Jerusalem was a national worship. The priests represented the whole people, the sacrifices were offered for Israel. Any of the nation might have the privilege of being present, or in absence he might be spiritually united with the worship in private prayer, as St. Peter was at Joppa. But in any case, and wherever he was, and however he was engaged, the sacrifices, he knew, were being

offered for him. The Christian communities which sprang out of Judaism—and everywhere, even if the people were chiefly Gentile in origin, their apostles were Jews—were already familiar with the conception of representative worship. Their Eucharists were intended to be a new and higher embodiment of it. At every altar, even where two or three only were gathered together, there is the whole Church by representation. In the humblest Eucharist we enter into that congregation which St. John describes in the Apocalypse, which begins with the four-and-twenty elders and the four living creatures, but is not complete until one hears the voices of " every created thing which is in the heaven and the earth and under the earth and on the sea and all that is in them," ascribing blessing and honour and glory and dominion unto Him that sitteth on the throne and unto the Lamb. The principle of representation permits each worshipper to feel that he himself is offering his praise, not only as his own, but in the name of all. It permits us to think of ourselves as representing not only all of our own generation, but all who have gone before us into Paradise. Indeed, in so far as all things are to be summed up in Christ, the worship of the Body of Christ is in the name, alike of angels and archangels and all the company of heaven, and on the other hand, of the dumb things of the lower nature that have no knowledge of God or voice to praise Him, and yet are His.

But representation implies authority to represent, and, from the first, the corporate Eucharist necessitated the creation of a ministry for its celebration. As Dr. Hamilton has reminded us, the celebration of the mysteries must be placed in the hands of one man, who would take the elements and give thanks and break the bread and give to all. If all that were wanted were to make an offering in the name of those present, a leader might be nominated on every occasion. If only the Church in the locality were to be represented, that Church could nominate a leader permanently or for a season. But if the congregation was really the whole Church of Christ by representation, then the authority to celebrate must come from the whole Church. No congregation would have the power to select a man, and then profess that his actions in the liturgy were the actions of the whole. This is precisely what the Church provides for by the institution of the apostolic ministry. Her universal practice does not mean that ordination conveys any supernatural or magical power of performing a miracle of consecration. The wonder that does occur is not the deed of the celebrant, but of the Holy Spirit in answer to the Church's prayer. The grace of Orders is a different thing altogether. The succession means that the Church's authority to act in her name is handed on, through those who possess it and the authority to bestow it, to the man ordained.

In a sense any man can offer the prayer of con-

secration, and the answer to it rests with God, but even if the answer were a true consecration, such a Eucharist would not be the Church's Eucharist. It would, on that supposition, be a means of grace to the communicants, but it would not unite them with the whole body of the faithful in the one corporate act of worship. It might convey the fullness of God's gift to man, but it would not express the fullness of man's gift to God. It would fall short in a point quite vital to Christianity, the union of all the members of Christ in adoration offered through Him to the Father. And so far it would be untrue worship, for in truth all the regenerate are one in Christ, and that unity must be expressed in worship.

The degree of actual sin involved in an unauthorised celebration varies according to spiritual conditions down to nothing. A certain poor woman, separated by circumstances from the Church and untaught about spiritual communion, was accustomed to go through the whole communion service with the use of bread and wine, as if she could be her own priest. One has some confidence that Christ's judgment on her was, "She hath done what she could"—the best that her knowledge taught her as the expression of her love. On the other hand, the man, or the congregation, who performed the service in avowed and unashamed separateness from the brethren, in intentional rebellion against their unity, would be guilty of an unChristlike spirit, and one could not but marvel at the long-

suffering love of God if He accepted the offering. Between the extremes there is room for a whole series of intermediate cases upon which no man is called to pass judgment. But in every case there is the same loss to the Eucharist. That it may be what it is meant to be, celebration by one whose act is the Church's act is required. It is the apostolic succession that admits us to our place in the congregation of the Apocalypse. It is the principle of representation that identifies our Eucharist with that Eucharist. It is the authority of the succession that makes us representative.

We could wish that those who speak of the reunion of Christendom could see it from this point of view. As the expression of mutual love reunion is desirable; for the prosperity of the work of God it is necessary; but by making possible the celebration of a worship from which no Christian has excluded himself, it would be a privilege and blessing that would bring the joys of heaven near to us. Before reunion comes, however, the vision of the joy of losing self in the beloved community must dawn upon men.

Liturgical form is for us another expression of the corporateness of worship. We do not want to offer our individual praise and prayer or to assist at those of the individual minister. We do not want the prayer that comes "straight from his heart," but rather one from the heart of the Church. Here, however, there can be no common counsel. The

Church's prayers are those which have gradually shaped themselves in history until they were polished with use and endeared by association with many generations of saints. At first the liturgy was the composition of the bishop who used it. There is no passage in the old books which points to really extemporaneous prayer. Justin's statement that the celebrant gives thanks "so much as he has power," would be applicable to a prayer book like Sarapion's. Every bishop might make such a prayer book if he chose. When the author of the Apostolic Constitutions wrote the Clementine liturgy he was only doing what bishops were doing continually. But one fact made for a fixed diocesan use. The bishop was very commonly chosen from among the clergy whom he was to lead, and he would be familiar with his predecessor's liturgy, and, generally speaking, would have no desire to make great changes in it. At the same time, a process of gradual change would be going on continually. No liturgy would be allowed to become old-fashioned, as ours has done. From the fourth century at least the influence of metropolitan churches and the renown of any markedly superior liturgy led to increased uniformity. A later instance which illustrates the process was the extension of the Sarum use far beyond its own diocese, and on the eve of the reformation to the whole province of Canterbury. The process may have been going on from the earliest times, but the increased inter-

course of bishops in the age of councils must have hastened it, and it is from that time that we begin to hear of the great liturgies with a national sphere of influence. There is no need to suppose a substitution of fixed for extempore prayers. What happened may have been rather the stereotyping of a bishop's already more or less fixed personal use into a diocesan use, and a selection—generally, perhaps, a survival of the fittest—by which certain liturgies became more and more widely used. It may be, however, that in the West extemporaneous worship was preferred, and that in this way arose the multitude of forms varying from Sunday to Sunday, and especially for festivals. Possibly a bishop prepared (and sometimes wrote) his liturgy as he did his sermons.

The rise of liturgies illustrates once more the corporate character of the Eucharist. Bishops came and went, but the change of the liturgy was felt to be undesirable just because the Church was always the same in spite of whatever change of membership. It was not good even for dioceses to differ unnecessarily, since the Eucharist was everywhere the sacrifice of the whole Church. The final dominance of the Roman liturgy in the West was not the result of papal ambition, but mainly of a desire in all the Churches to imitate Rome, and partly of the superiority which the fixed liturgy possesses over the variable one, which naturally sometimes varies for the worse.

However clearly we desire to emphasise the corporate character of public worship, it is right to remember also that the congregation consists of individuals. Now this has left its mark on liturgical custom. There are three ways of making prayers, and they suggest three degrees of unity. First, we may all speak together as we do in confessions and creeds. We are then one in purpose, but each man speaks for himself. We are individuals, though similar individuals. Secondly, we may in some way share the prayer, as we do in litanies, or when it is divided between a verse and a response. Here the individuals are brought into reciprocal relations with each other for mutual assistance in the work of prayer, as in all work. Thirdly, one leader only may speak, and the rest pray with him and through him as a spokesman, probably saying "Amen" to his prayer. Here all have become one body and the individual is merged in it. The first form knows of many souls, the second of many who are members one of another, the third of many who are one Body in Christ. In the central and essential part of the Eucharist, the *anaphora*, the one voice alone is heard. In the introductory service, or in secondary accompaniments, we have litanies. In our daily offices the progress towards union is clearly marked by the Lord's Prayer said all together, the versicles and the collects.

But if we are going to teach the Church to worship again, shall we do well to adhere at all times to

fixed liturgical formularies, published by authority? On the whole they are good. It is easier to fix our attention upon an extempore prayer, but it is far harder to pray it. This seems to be common experience. In extempore prayer there is, for some, the labour of understanding what is meant; for others, the temptation to criticise; for all, the increased effort of hearing. There is always the leader's danger of preaching when he ought to pray. Useful extempore prayer in a public service can only be an accessory. It should be definite and concise, and, above all, must express the real desire or thanksgiving of the whole body. But if we could only get rid of the mistake we have made in treating the Prayer Book as a doctrinal standard, there is no reason why it should be more exactly orthodox than our hymns are. The fear of a dangerous unorthodoxy is a baseless one.

The reason why liberty of praying should be accorded to the individual pastor of a congregation is simply that reality and truth demand some colouring of our worship by local and temporary circumstances. Now, in the Eucharist the main theme is invariable. Whatever our condition, this thanksgiving is our chief one, this communion our heart's desire. But there are just three ways in which our worship may vary. First, we may be chiefly occupied with some particular aspect of Christ's work for us. This is already provided for by variable lections and prefaces, the number

of which will some day be increased. Secondly, our secondary motives for thankfulness vary. At present none of them have any place at all, and therefore we may postpone consideration of them—only saying that here liberty might be allowed. Thirdly, our intercessions might vary from place to place and from time to time. There is no part of the service where the personal touch is more needed. If all the members are to rejoice with each one who rejoices and weep with each one who weeps, intercession, and especially Eucharistic intercession, is their most important and most appreciated mode of sympathy. It ought to be a recognised fact of our liturgy that a place is made for it, and that it is a practice not simply allowed but encouraged and even urged upon us. Unless it is authorised it cannot be regulated, and a certain amount of regulation is surely needed. In connection with this variableness the custom of publicly, before the intercession, asking for prayers for particular persons or needs would naturally be continued and developed.

The unavoidable disuse of the ancient kiss of peace removed a feature of the liturgy exactly expressing that care of the members of Christ for one another which we still need to recognise. Instead of the kiss our ordinary friendly greeting is the handshake, or the bow, or words of welcome, and though some Eastern Churches have in their liturgies adopted these symbolical actions, it is more natural to us to think of reviving the ancient

"pax" by spoken words. In accordance with the principle already laid down these would have to be responsory, and the position of them would be in the neighbourhood of the offertory.

This introduces to our notice another reform which is needed for the revival of worship. We must abandon our distrust of ceremonial. We must delight in offering to God our bodies as well as our spirits. For they also are of His creation, and if they cannot do much to honour Him that is all the greater reason for allowing them to do what they can. The Sacraments of the Gospel are the pledge that this is the will of God. In the two acts of worship commanded by Christ the body is obliged to take part. The water must be visibly poured by the hand of the minister upon the baptised. The bread and wine must be visibly given, taken and received. The body cannot be excluded, or even ignored, in the use of sacraments. Nobody with any grasp of Christian truth thinks that it is as important as the spirit, or that formal actions can take the place of spiritual worship. But it is also a failure to understand Christianity if we become suspicious of all bodily action, of all ceremonial, in our service. Certain actions have been from the first welcomed as good body-worship. Such are the bowing of the head, kneeling, or prostration, which imply the reverence and humility in which we come to God, and the sign of faith, the making of the sign of the Cross upon ourselves, a practice much earlier

than any recorded use of a material cross as an ornament of the Church.

A congregational ceremony allied to these personal ones is the procession. Orderly movement, with such accompaniments as are used in any procession, secular or religious—that is to say, music and singing, lights and banners—is one of the most natural ways of expressing solemn rejoicing or grave occupation. To go in procession to the opening of a parliament, or to the commemorative festivity of trade unions, means that these are important and impressive occasions. On religious occasions the movement and its accompaniments will be solemn and dignified; nevertheless, they are our equivalent for David's dancing before the Ark, and the psalmist's " Praise Him in cymbals and dances."

In the perfected liturgy of the early Church there were three great processions, as we have already seen, and it will be noticed that the movement was in each case purposeful. The entrance of the ministers was important because it inaugurated the service. The procession of the Gospels symbolised the going forth into the world of the messengers of Christ. The great entrance was the first solemn act of oblation. Processions round the church, on the other hand, are purposeless. They are said to be processions to the altar, but nothing particular is done when the altar is reached. A similar procession before a celebration is justified, because there is a good reason for going to the altar—

namely, the Eucharist which is to follow. The High Churchman rather scorns the processional entrance with hymn singing, but there is no reason for his scorn. A procession out of the church, for which the name recession is quite correct and convenient, is, however, only justifiable when the departure from church is solemn and important. It may be claimed that every act of worship sends us out to live in accordance with our professions, but neither the daily offices nor the Eucharist are intended as preliminary to Christian life. Rather they are its culmination in that knowledge and worship of God which are its highest occupations. But a recession from an ordination, or from the benediction of a missionary as he goes to his work, or from the solemnising of a marriage, is correct symbolism and useful for edification. A recession after evensong with an evening hymn is apparently a procession to bed.

We have dwelt upon the meaning of processions because our present misuse of them is a warning against thoughtlessness and antiquarianism in the employment of ceremonial. We pass now to another aspect of its usefulness. We should aim at using in the worship of God as many as possible of His good gifts. God rejoices in all the work of His hands. That which we can offer to Him as good is that which is a source of joy to ourselves. Hence their æsthetic value determines the use of things, and we have to beware of simply turning worship

into self-indulgence, as an occasion of æsthetic pleasure. Flowers, for instance, are a most natural way of offering to God the beauty of His earth, but a florally decorated church may become only a sensuous pleasure to ourselves. Music is a still more insidious temptation, because it enters into so close a union with the words of worship. Of all ceremonial it is the most dangerous, and yet the most generally tolerated — probably because it is also the most helpful to our emotion. The employment of lights and colour is far less objectionable on the score of danger, while incense, because the sense of smell has so great a suggestive value by association of ideas, is good for edification and has also abundance of scriptural warrant.

Closely connected with such offerings is the sanctification of human faculties, the special talents of the gifted, by their employment in worship. By that means the gift is thankfully used for God and, as it were, given again to Him. The musician's gift, whether of composition or reproduction, whether of instrumental or vocal music, ought to have opportunities of exercise, while the brethren glorify the Giver of it rather than the possessor. So is it with architecture. A beautiful church is a beautiful gift to God, with the advantage that all the congregation can join in giving it because of its admirable costliness. In subordination to the architect, the painter and the sculptor, the workers in wood and in metals and in textile fabrics, all have their

own honourable place. By all these means we confess God to be the giver of all talents.

But is there no danger in excess? Not, we think, if the proper subordination of the body to the spirit is preserved. This is accomplished, first, by insisting on symbolism. Every external act and every outward beauty must enshrine a spiritual truth. The instinct which has invented a meaning for such a detail as the mixed chalice (at first a mere utilitarian custom) is a thoroughly sound one. The vestment to be regarded with suspicion is, above all, the vestment that means nothing. Danger lurks in every externality which cannot be saved from becoming a dumb ceremony. In the second place, because the outward is subordinate to the spiritual, the proper place for rich ceremonial is in the preliminaries rather than in the heart of worship. This is well exemplified in the great liturgies. The *anaphora* is almost bald in its simplicity. It was the *missa catechumenorum* and the *pro-anaphora* that were adorned with processions, lights and hymns. After all, there may be something to be said in defence of an ornamental matins followed by a plain Eucharist.

There is another method of dignifying the service which is closely allied with ceremonial. It is the allocation of its duties among a number of ministers. Our fathers understood this well when they provided for the distribution of the lessons and other elements of the hour services among the members

of the chorus. They understood also that for dignity the many must become one in orderly co-operation, and they secured unity by the officiant's benediction of each reader and by the institution of rulers of the choir. So at a modern Eucharist one of the most impressive moments, considering it only as a spectacle, is when the celebrant hands to a number of assistants the sacred elements which they are to administer with him. Nothing so robs a service of dignity as to entrust it wholly to one man. It is probably a dim perception of this that has led to the glorification of quite unworthy choirs. Their surplices and their prominence in the chancel have a usefulness which even musical inefficiency cannot quite destroy. We are reminded that in our country numerous assistants can only be obtained by employing laymen, but there is no possible objection to laymen if they are carefully chosen and under strict discipline. They will themselves evolve much natural, and therefore desirable, ceremonial. Laymen cannot even collect the people's alms without turning the operation into a quite beautiful ceremony, which only provokes criticism because other parts of the service have not been developed in proportion. There is no one quite so "ritualistic" as the lay server who values his office. The extension of the principle would be advantageous, and it may even be held that men may be admitted to Holy Orders without abandoning secular work, as they certainly must have been in

early times. Men who are not called to the ministry of preaching may yet do service as assistant ministers of the sacraments. The saying of the litany, the reading of the epistle and gospel, and the ministry at the offertory, will easily be conceded to them. And if we revived, as we might do, the deacon's part in the Eastern liturgies, the bidding of prayers and the litanies during intervals, these also might be entrusted to clerics in secular occupations, if not to laymen. Indeed convenience, and in the near future perhaps necessity, may suggest their taking part in the administration of the communion. There are plenty of men in honourable callings—professional men, teachers, artisans—whose lives are perfectly consistent with even that high duty, if the bishops are willing some day to give them, by ordination, the authority to perform it.

Now it may seem that so far we are trying to win people to worship, by increasing the external attractiveness of our service, and if we do that we are certainly bound to fail. But that is not really our aim. We want to give external expression to a dignity which the worship intrinsically possesses, but which most people do not understand. The pictures on the walls of the old churches have been called the Bible of the ignorant, and in the same way ceremony is the Prayer Book of the spiritually unenlightened. For those who are full grown in spiritual discernment the fact of the Real Presence is all-sufficiently attractive, and for those who

ponder upon it the whole liturgy is a worthy worship however plainly celebrated. But such people are confessedly few amongst us. The invitation of the Eucharist falls upon deaf ears. We need to reveal to them what a treasure they are passing by. And in addition our contention all along has been that ceremony is in itself desirable. It is not a matter of taste, or rather, the man who has no taste for ceremony is the one who has not yet learned the true nature of public corporate worship. He is like the man who turns away from the best painting or listens unmoved to the highest music. But we cannot be content, when it comes to worship, to leave him in his unenlightened condition.

At all events the same criticism cannot be urged against our next point, that our service needs to be brought in touch with the best results of human progress, and that in three ways.

First, we have to give a warm welcome to modern knowledge, as " treasure trove upon our own manor." So far as it is knowledge it reveals God, and in our thanksgivings to Him we must include its revelations. The difficulty is that we are not agreed how far it is knowledge. But, at least, modern science has revealed the reign of law in nature, and we have learned to see that her uniformity is extremely advantageous to us, and a true blessing upon our lives. It alone enables us to deal hopefully and securely with the world. This, then, as an example, might be recognised in our thanksgiving, even if

we are not ready to include an evolutionary hymn that would do for us what the 104th Psalm did for the ancient Jew.

Secondly, we have to acknowledge what a much better place the world is for us than for our ancestors. That we are a law-abiding people living in internal peace, that we are free from the personal tyranny of autocrats, that so many dangers by sea and land have been reduced, that so much pain has been removed by medical and surgical discoveries—these, and such as these, are the blessings that men are really thankful for and would gladly give thanks for in church if we would allow them. Our Church has laboured well and manfully for education, but now that education is within the reach of every child, we say nothing. We only gird at the defects which still remain. It is no small thing that our men have been awakened to take a manly part, with intelligence and foresight, in the government of the land. Compare our condition with that of a century ago, and it will be felt at once that our silence is a thankless one. Why should a working man be attracted to a worship which has consistently ignored the fact that he has become a man?

Thirdly, and arising out of such thoughts, our intercessions should be modernised. We may indeed confess with some surprise that our present prayers can be used for the expression of our needs more successfully than could have been expected, but for that purpose we have to read our meaning

into them. Yet in political affairs, to begin with, everything has become new. We have no mention of cabinet ministers, or of the besetting danger of the party spirit, or of the new importance of the individual elector in public policy. We are largely dependent for our laws upon the agencies which mould opinion, upon newspapers and political labour councils and all manner of associations, yet we do not seek God's guidance of them. We live in enervating luxury hitherto undreamed of, yet we say no word of fear, and ask for no protection. We know the evils of commercialism, materialism, cruel competition, unashamed frivolity, and do not ask to be delivered from them. We expect a social transformation, even a revolution, and do not pray that it may be for good. Even in our own religious concerns we are strangely dumb. We do pray for the unity of Christendom, but only once a year do we acknowledge our unhappy divisions, or ask for enlightenment to deal with them. We might well say something about quarrels within our own Church. But most of all we should not ignore the practical aloofness, in many cases the apostasy, of so many of our people. If we invite all the faithful to be communicants, we should not see them turn their backs, Sunday after Sunday, and make no complaint to God. If we discuss, in meeting after meeting, the leakage of our adolescents, we might lay the matter before Him. And if we utilise the services of our laity in countless ways, we might

as well give up speaking (except on Good Friday) as if the clergy alone had a ministry and the laity were only to be ministered to.

So complicated has society become, and so multitudinous are our needs, that the work of intercession threatens to overpass our capacity and the time that we can spare for it. We need forms that will be miracles of conciseness, or else we must resort to variable and alternative forms, which is undesirable. But at all events our prayer for the Church Militant must become what a Eucharistic intercession ought to be in the Church of to-day and for the needs of modern life.

We reach now the central action of the liturgy, the reconstruction of which is most necessary if the people are to learn again to worship. Here we shall, in the first place, demand the entire absence of the Roman oblation of the Body and Blood of Christ. This we have shown to be without scriptural authority and without ecclesiastical precedent worthy of any serious consideration. Its appearance even at Rome was accidental, and its extension to other parts of the Western Church was not the result of its own acceptability, but of the quite independent prestige of the Roman see. Whatever is said to the contrary, it does infringe the unique finality of the Sacrifice of the Cross, but apart from that, it depends on a theory of the Atonement which we have also found reason to regard as uncatholic and erroneous.

Along with this we discard the Roman—or at least Italian—conception of the consecration of the elements, and must therefore reinstate the older consecration by prayer, in its original position at the end of the Eucharistic worship. In doing this we are but following the example of the Scottish and American branches of our communion. Either of their forms might well be adopted, but there are reasons for preferring the American one. Both pray that the Father may bless and sanctify with His word and Holy Spirit these gifts and creatures of bread and wine, but while the Scottish prayer adds, "that they may become the Body and Blood" of Christ, the American, like the English, asks, "that we receiving them . . . may be partakers of His most blessed Body and Blood." The former has the support of all the great liturgies, but the latter, in sense at least, is still more primitive. Although controversy tempts us to advocate the language which most clearly affirms the objective Presence, we shall do better to remember that to ask for the Presence within us is the larger request and really includes the other, for the worship which contents itself with the contemplation of God is less perfect than that which finds its consummation in union with Him. And there is also a practical gain in not raising the question about the mode of the Presence, which has so often led men into folly and error—at all events not to do so in the very heart of our highest worship. We must resist the Anglican

habit of making our Prayer Book a standard of doctrine, which, after all, is only another form of the Protestant defect of turning prayers into preaching. We want to gather together all who acknowledge that in the Holy Communion there is a real gift to us of Christ's Body and Blood, and that the outward signs are the means whereby we receive the grace. It would be unwise to sow seeds of discord in our already quarrelsome Church.

A return to the old custom of making a separation between our thanksgiving for temporal blessings and those for our redemption—between the old creation and the new—is desirable for many reasons. It introduces an ascending scale of worship which leads up to the climax of the *anamnesis*, the consecration and the communion. Practically it serves to protect the higher themes from interference through the liberty we propose for local and temporary thanksgivings. The permission to depart from the authorised form will only apply to the portion of the thanksgiving before the *Tersanctus*. This angelic hymn will also receive its due recognition as the triumphant close of the praise of the first creation. We shall be able to restore to it the *Benedictus qui venit*, the real purpose of which is to introduce the new song of the redeemed, by a reference to the Incarnation. The special thanksgivings on festival days which we know as proper prefaces must of course be placed after the *Tersanctus*, whereby another Roman barbarism will

be corrected. Thanksgiving for the Incarnation will lead up to the recital of the Institution, from which the manual acts will naturally be omitted. This will be followed by a thankful remembrance of the Death and Resurrection and Ascension of our Lord. The omission of this in our liturgy is quite contradictory of the Prayer Book's own teaching—notably of the catechism, which makes the continual remembrance of the Death of Christ and the benefits which we receive thereby the primary reason for the ordinance of the sacrament. Such a memorial is, also, the most effective of all safeguards against the idea that the Sacrifice is mystically renewed or repeated in the Eucharist. But the reformers were in a difficulty because of the position of the mediæval *anamnesis* after consecration. The adoption of the catholic mode of consecration removes the difficulty altogether.

The *anamnesis* is more than a thanksgiving. It is a memorial by means of the elements offered to God. They have been already offered by being placed on the altar, in addition to which no words were required to show that they were given to God to be used by Him. And the use was fully understood to be their consecration as Christ's Body and Blood. Since then, by the words of institution, they have been more precisely identified with their symbolical meaning, and many see in the oblation which follows a symbolical offering of Christ to the Father as a memorial of His self-oblation on the

Cross. But if we are to give to the word "offer" its full and proper meaning, we must do more than, so to speak, hold them up before Him, which would be the correct symbolism of our pleading Christ and His death for us. This may be included, and there may also be included a repetition of the actual surrender of them for God's use, with a more definite reference to the imminent consecration. Indeed, this is all that the service can distinctly suggest, because it is all that the plain man can be expected to appreciate.

To those who look below the surface a deeper truth reveals itself. For our salvation God did everything and man nothing, except that from our human nature the body of Christ's obedience was prepared, of the substance of the Virgin Mary, His Mother. So now our human part is to provide from the creatures of God, given to us, those elements which God will make the means of grace to us. God-made-man was the Atonement. Divine grace united with created matter is the means of His gift of Himself to us. That which we offer now is fitly the memorial of that which humanity afforded God for His redemptive work. This thought may be worth following out, but all that the liturgy can say is that we make by means of the creatures of bread and wine, a symbolical pleading of Christ's death as our one way of access to God.

After the consecration only two actions are allowed by Catholic custom, intercession and com-

munion. The latter is attended by subordinate elements, namely, by prayers of preparation, the fraction or breaking of the bread for distribution, the commixture and the invitation to draw near, all of which stand of course before it, and by thanksgiving after it. Between the two main sections the Lord's Prayer is placed, originally, it would seem, as the introduction to the communion. We have suggested that the intercession should follow communion, partly because the work of intercession belongs to those who are united with the heavenly High Priest, and by virtue of their union, and partly because otherwise the communion is unduly separated from the consecration. This last reason may be claimed as essential to the genius of the English rite, and it is not simply anti-Roman and controversial. It means that we receive the communion not only as a means of strength and refreshment, but as the crowning act of worship. The goal of it all is God Himself and union with Him through the one mediator, Jesus Christ, both God and man. We do not desire to depart from this principle. We do not want to make communion an appendix to our worship, a thing instituted only for the benefit of man. Even the great liturgies did that, and in consequence communion ceased to be regarded as continually desirable. According to the truly primitive conception it is the union in which Christ's love as well as our own is satisfied. "Behold, I stand at the door and knock: if any man hear My

voice and open the door, I will come in and will sup with him, and he with Me."

Thus we regard our rearrangement chiefly as a moving forward of the act of communion. After the consecration will come the prayer of humble access or a similar prayer of preparation. The fraction and commixture may be made in silence, or during them and the priest's communion a hymn may be sung. The invitation will then be given, and the people will make their communion. The latter half of our present words of administration may be turned into words of invitation, once spoken. Immediately following the reception the intercessions will be offered and will lead up to the Lord's Prayer. Then our present Thanksgiving, the *Gloria in excelsis*, and the benediction will preserve our customary noble conclusion.

One prayer, it seems, wholly disappears—the prayer of oblation. Its prayer for acceptance, its little intercession, and its prayer for a good communion are all represented sufficiently in their proper places. But the self-oblation of the Church is not. The liturgy of St. James has an invocation praying that the Holy Spirit may come both upon us and upon the gifts. In the same way we may find it possible to unite the offering of ourselves with that of the gifts in the *anamnesis*. It is too good a feature of our liturgy to lose altogether.

A final question may be asked. We have added the *anamnesis*, and given opportunity for lengthen-

ing the first thanksgiving and the intercession. We have encouraged ceremonial in the *missa catechumenorum* and the *pro-anaphora*. Will not the service be unduly long? It may be shortened, first, by the omission of everything that precedes the collects for the day, especially on weekdays, and on Sundays when the Litany or part of it precedes the celebration, or at supplementary celebrations on days of special communion. But it may also be shortened, and very desirably, by the use of a shorter formula of administration, and by the increase of the number of ministrants if that should be found possible. By these curtailments the whole liturgy may be made no longer than our present one.

It must not be supposed that we imagine that our people will at once welcome an improved liturgy and hasten to make use of it. The revival of the spirit of worship must require patient teaching and devout example. But no success in these endeavours is possible unless the service to which we lead them satisfies the craving, the thirst for God, which we have aroused, and while satisfying it, ever renews it afresh until it becomes the passion of the lovers of God. Our present liturgy, with its severely penitential atmosphere, its broken and repressed thanksgiving, its mangled memorial, has wholly failed, and probably will always fail, to excite and foster that emotion of self-losing love which is indispensable for worship.

APPENDIX

It may tend to clearness if I add some liturgical forms embodying my conclusions. I do not emulate the saintly men who alone are qualified for such spiritual artistry; what follows should be regarded somewhat as we do those blackboard diagrams, which are used, without pretension, for the illustration of scientific and other lectures.

For shortness I simply indicate by the usual titles those portions which are identical with our present service. It is assumed also that the usual ministers assist, that Catholic ceremonial is to be employed at processions and elsewhere, and that the Litany or Matins may have immediately preceded the liturgy. The elements should be prepared beforehand. If the celebrant preaches, the chasuble need not be worn until the great entrance.

The bishop would be required to regulate the use of additional thanksgivings and intercessions. He might order that they should be in all cases written, and preserved for his inspection if necessary. No hymn should be allowed except such as are authorised by the bishop for use at any given point in the service.

THE ORDER OF THE LITURGY

During the procession of the ministers to the altar a psalm or approved hymn may be sung.

The priest standing before the midst of the altar, and facing the people, says—

The Lord be with you.

Answer. And with thy spirit.

Priest. Let us pray.

Turning to the altar he says the collects, such as the collect for purity, the prayer of St. Chrysostom, and last, the variable collect of the day.

The Epistle *is read.*

The deacon goes in procession to the lectern or pulpit, a hymn being sung.

The Holy Gospel.

The Creed is sung, and the sermon, if there is one, is preached. During the collection of the alms announcements connected with approaching festivals, or fast days, or services of the church, may be made. The alms are presented in silence.

The priest or deacon, suitably attended, brings the elements from the sacristy in procession, a hymn being sung. The elements are offered in silence. The deacon then invites prayer for such persons, or for such purposes, as occasion requires.

The Pax.

The priest, turning to the people (*who are standing*), *gives the* Salutation, *and then he says*—

Priest. Beloved, let us love one another.

Answer. For love is of God.

Priest. We being many are one body in Christ.

Answer. And every one members one of another.

Priest. Ye that do truly, etc.

The Confession, Absolution *and* Comfortable Words.

The Sursum Corda.

Turning to the altar he says the preface, "It is very meet . . . Everlasting God." *Then he adds such thanksgivings for temporal blessings as the occasion requires, or he may say*—

Who by Thyself and for Thyself hast created all things, and in Thy excellent wisdom hast given to each its law, and appointed the season of its appearing; Who madest man in Thine own image, to rule over the earth and to subdue it, but also to lift up his face to Thee in holy worship, Whom Seraphim and Cherubim adore and serve, and all the angels joyfully obey. Therefore with angels. . . .

The Tersanctus.

And the priest continues—

All glory and praise be unto Thee, Almighty Father, Who in Thy loving kindness hast respect unto our infirmity, and art plenteous in mercy,

though we have sinned against Thee. For Thou hast visited and redeemed Thy people through Jesus Christ, Thy only-begotten Son, our Lord.

Here follows on Festivals the special Thanksgiving. (The present proper prefaces can be used with slight grammatical alteration of the first words, and on Ascension Day, "Who died and rose again for us, and after His most glorious Resurrection . . ." etc.) *And he continues—*

Blessing and glory and worship and praise be unto Thee, Who hast chosen us in Thy eternal purpose, and called us through Him Who loved us and gave Himself for us, Who also, fulfilling the ministry of His humiliation, did institute these holy mysteries, that we receiving the benefits of His Passion and being quickened by His Resurrection, might be partakers of His divine nature and be filled with all the fullness of God.

For in the same night . . . *and the rest of the Institution.*

Wherefore, O Lord and heavenly Father, according to the institution of Thy Son Jesus Christ, we present ourselves before Thy divine Majesty, having in remembrance His blessed Passion and precious Death, His mighty Resurrection and glorious Ascension, rendering unto Thee most hearty thanks for the unspeakable blessings procured unto us by the same; and humbly we offer unto Thee, together with the service of ourselves, our souls and bodies, this bread and this wine, Thy holy Church's oblation

of Thine own gifts, the memorial of our Saviour Jesus Christ, our sacrifice of praise. And we beseech Thee to send Thy Holy Spirit, the Lord and Giver of Life, upon us and upon these Thy creatures of bread and wine, that we receiving them, in remembrance of the saving death and passion of Thy Son Jesus Christ, may be made partakers of His most blessed Body and Blood, and be sanctified both in body and soul, and preserved unto everlasting life. Through the same Jesus Christ our Lord, by Whom and with Whom, in the unity of the same Holy Spirit, all honour and glory be unto Thee, O Father Almighty, world without end. Amen.

The Communicants' Prayer.

O Lord, the Beginning and the Ending, wonderful in all Thy doings and holy in all Thy works, in Whom all things that Thou hast made are perfected and fulfilled, Who madest us for Thyself and art alone our spirits' Resting-place; cast not out, we beseech Thee, us Thy unworthy servants, but sanctify us wholly in spirit and soul and body; take from us every evil thought, every base desire, every perverse imagination, and all that rises up in us against Thy holy will. Grant us to draw near with such penitence and humility, such confidence and faith, such hunger and thirst for Thee, that worthily partaking of Thy mysteries we may be made one with Thee, and Thou with us, and ever abiding in Thee may bring forth fruit unto holiness, now and henceforth

and unto the day of Thine appearing, when we shall see Thee face to face in Thy glory, where, with the Father and the Holy Ghost, Thou livest and reignest, one God, world without end. Amen.

The Communion.

During the communion of the priest and ministers a hymn may be sung. Then the priest, turning to the people, with those who are to assist him, shall say—

Draw near, beloved, eat and drink, in remembrance that Christ shed His Blood and died for you, and feed on Him in your hearts by faith with thanksgiving.

And at the administration to each the minister shall say the first half of the present words.

After the communion of the people, the priest, standing before the altar, says—

The Thanksgiving and Intercession.

(*Other intercessions may be inserted as occasion requires.*)

O Lord and Heavenly Father, Thou Shepherd of Israel, Who hast prepared for Thy people a Table in the wilderness, we give Thee humble thanks that Thou hast fed us, who have duly received these holy mysteries, with the spiritual Food of the Body and Blood of Christ. And we beseech Thee that being strengthened and refreshed thereby we may live faithfully unto Thee, and ever abide in Thee

and in our Lord Jesus Christ Thy Son, and may have fellowship with all who are of His mystical Body, especially with the ever-blessed Virgin Mary, His Mother, and with all His Apostles, Evangelists, and Martyrs, and with all holy and humble men of heart who before us have entered into rest, and for whose benefits and examples we thank Thee, glorifying Thee for Thy grace declared in them.

O God of our fathers, we pray Thee, through Jesus Christ our Redeemer and the High Priest of our offerings, remember Thy holy Church, still militant throughout the world, that being enlarged by the conversion of the heathen, and adorned with the holiness of her children, she may be wholly devoted to Thy service in unity and inward peace.

Grant to all bishops who bear rule in her, together with their clergy, both priests and deacons, that through Thy Holy Spirit they may be fit instruments for Thy using, as ministers of Christ and faithful stewards of Thy mysteries. And make all Thy people a royal priesthood, a holy nation, offering to Thee spiritual sacrifices and a perfect obedience.

We beseech Thee for the children whom Thou hast given, that having been made members of Christ, they may increase in Thy faith, fear and love, and being strengthened by Thy grace may continue Thine for ever.

Remember the rulers of all Christian nations, and especially George our King, together with his advisers, parliaments, judges, and all who are in

authority under him, and all who lead the minds of the people in affairs of State. Grant to them such wisdom, zeal and integrity that under their government we may seek each other's good, being knit together in one fellowship, and delivered from all temptations of the evil one, and whether in prosperity or adversity may be found walking in Thy ways.

We pray especially for all who suffer hardship or affliction, in mind, body, or estate, beseeching Thee to be their Refuge and Strength, and to make us the ministers of Thy consolations.

We beseech Thee for those departed this life in Thy holy faith. Grant them, according to Thy unfailing love, whatsoever Thou knowest them to need of Thee, though we know not; that being partakers of blessedness beyond what we can ask or think, they may attain also to a joyful resurrection, and eternal life in the full knowledge and clear vision of Thy glory. Grant our petitions, O Merciful Father, and pardon their imperfections, through Jesus Christ our Saviour; through Whom we beseech Thee for all Thy children, in the words which He has taught us—

Our Father, *with the Doxology.*

The Gloria in Excelsis.

The Benediction.

The ablutions follow immediately unless what remains of the Consecrated Elements is required for the Communion of the sick.

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY
RICHARD CLAY & SONS, LIMITED,
BRUNSWICK ST., STAMFORD ST., S.E.,
AND BUNGAY, SUFFOLK.